HOMO DEMENS

Essays on changing times, technocracy and corporatism

Tom-Oliver Regenauer

For the future.

HOMO DEMENS

Essays on changing times, technocracy and corporatism

regenauer.press | Anthology 2022

Tom-Oliver Regenauer

Imprint:

© 2023 regenauer.press Swiss Caldera Media,
c/o mgmt International Management GmbH,
CH-6926 Montagnola

E-Mail: info@regenauer.press

Editorially responsible: Tom-Oliver Regenauer Cover

Collages: Sebastian Herrling Cover

Design: Tom-Oliver Regenauer

Text Layout: Robert Schumann | Buchgut

Translation: Silvia Lorenz

Photography: Inés Kieferle | www.bildwerk7.de

Production and Publishing: BoD—Books on Demand GmbH | Norderstedt/Germany

Bibliographic information of the German National Library: The German National Library lists this publication in the German National Bibliography. Detailed bibliographic data are available on the internet at www.dnb.de.

Against tyranny.

Table of Content

Prologue	9
Path Into the Unknown	15
Parallel World Narrative	28
Mao, Yale and Hegemony	44
Sports Kills	64
Trotsky, the Commonwealth and Wall Street	76
The Trojan Herd	94
Ordo ad Chao	109
Bioethics: The Eugenics of Late Modernity	119
Crisis – or War?	138
Destination Technocracy	155
Ukraine: False Friends – False Enemies	170
Nothing Is Impossible	183
They Were Never Gone	194
Twitter, Tricolor and Total Hysteria	207
The Day After	217
Constituted Crime	225
Collective Self-destruction	239
Green – The New Brown	257
Ideology of the Turning Point	269
Plague or Cholera?	283
Tragedy and Hope	292
Late Roman Decadence 2.0	307
Liberal Braggers	323
Working Class Hero	336
Working Class Hero (John Lennon, 1971)	355
Overheated Cultural Revolution	356
Homo demens	364
I Am the State!	377
Harbingers of Dystopia	389

Reappraisal – Now! **401**
The Grotesque Protests **407**
Coveted Coolness **422**
Meet: Bertrand Russell **438**
Bubble Factory Hollywood **451**
Normative Collectivism **467**
Cacophony of Corporatism **478**
Life Is Beautiful! **498**
Excuse or Resolution **508**
About the Author **516**

Prologue

In Germany, the third consecutive year of the "new normal"—2022—came to an end with a bit of fanfare. A reflection on that year invariably gives rise to mixed feelings. On the one hand, the turning point ushered in by German Chancellor Olaf Scholz with his famous *Zeitenwende* speech held on February 27, 2022 resulted in considerable collateral damage and continues to gain momentum. On the other hand, on the smoking ruins of neo-feudal predatory capitalism, we are seeing the inchoate beginnings of a liberal, decentralized civil society of tomorrow.

Within a very short time, the supposed pandemic of the century, which had kept the world in suspense since the beginning of 2020, dissipated into an almost deafening cacophony of multiple crises. The faint hope for a restoration of the "old normal," although shared by many people to this day, is now likely to give way to a dreary realism even among the greatest optimists.

Socio-economic turbulence is spreading, the supranational takeover of power by democratically illegitimate bureaucracies is progressing, and the essentially inhumane Fourth Industrial Revolution" is increasingly permeating everyday life. Society is more divided than ever. Germany's so-called facade democracy, fragile all along, is broken. It can be likened to a glass house that has been shattered, leaving behind only its shards, scattered on the ground. Nor are we seeing any signs of a spontaneous order taking shape, contrary to evolutionary nature. And every new

rift that the conductors of chaos move into the public space has the force to break any remaining, modest visions for the future into further splinters.

The echo chambers are getting smaller—and the spaces of fear are getting bigger.

Indeed, there is absolutely nothing that will be as it once was. Maybe that's a good thing. After all, the year 2022 has shown what is possible when like-minded people come together and collaborate, when altruism takes precedence over financial interests, when love triumphs over hate. The potential this holds is not to be underestimated, especially in a system that is fundamentally sick and destructive.

Time for a new start, namely from the remnants of its sovereign foundations rather than through class struggle from above. A fairer, more humane and more decentralized world is possible at any time. Indeed, the bitter experiences, insights and disillusionments of the recent past may have been the missing link in giving humanity that push to pull itself together and to recognize its exuberant potential for change.

Unfortunately, *Homo sapiens* often learns through pain rather than by inspiration or guidance to act more rationally. Thus, the crises, conflicts and wars of postmodernism, culminating in unrest, uncertainty and resentment, not only seconded the end of an era but also evoked the natural countermovement.

Dehumanizing technocracy, organized crime in top-level politics, mafia-like activities of public-private partnerships and NGOs as well as the insatiable greed of globalized corporatism engender a panopticon of epochal windows of opportunity for the human

species. This comprises the chance to finally free oneself from the constraints of a feudal system that has always served only the few at the expense of the many.

At no point in the history of civilization have as many of our fellow humans been simultaneously aware of it than at this moment. This is because in the year 2022 the faceless empire has fully revealed its ugly visage, featuring primarily the doctrine of biosafety, shameless oligarchy and a globalized surveillance state. The geopolitical maneuvers, geo-economic transformation processes, social-ethical breaches and culture-revolutionary dogmatism all speak for themselves. The masks have finally come off. The enemy has taken shape. Cracks in the matrix of a burgeoning totalitarianism are hastily, and only fleetingly, concealed with increasingly schizophrenic narratives or strawmen. What we are left with is a clumsy patchwork for fabrications of lies and Potemkin villages.

Those who are still participating in that system at this point are either not in full possession of their mental faculties—or knowingly dedicate themselves to the dark side of history. At the same time, no one wants to be known as a narrow-minded follower once the truth comes out.

For me, the year 2022, as the COVID crisis was fading out, was primarily a "year of people." It was a year where the despots and liars began hoping for amnesty for their crimes or, at least, for a type of amnesia of the events that took place. We think only of those functionaries who did not have to apologize or resign, relying instead on character assassination of dissenters. Ad hominem was thus their remedy of choice. It was the year of those agitators who reduced concepts such as solidarity, peace and pacifism to absurdity, so much so that "Make 1984 fiction again" became a slogan among dissenters.

It was the year of newspeak, blind collectivism, cognitive dissonance and the continued devolution of *Homo sapiens* to a slave to platform economics and technological progress.

It was also the year of post-truth propaganda beyond the darkest premonitions, during which it once again became unmistakably clear that journalism according to the definition of the press code can no longer be expected from corporate, leading and mass media. The so-called fourth pillar of democracy has long been comprised of the new media. Without the new media on board, the icy stranglehold of totalitarianism would have loosened its grip much more slowly. This is why they are so massively attacked, defamed, blocked and censored. If anything, this constitutes a bittersweet stigma of success, and temporary at that. After all, the past three years have probably only been a warm-up for a decade of tyranny, a kick-off so to speak. They paved the way to dystopia.

However, I will remember the year 2022 primarily because of all the positive encounters with people. Never before have so many people come into my life within a few months, with whom I share not only convictions, values and moral principles but also passions, joie de vivre and the "unbearable lightness of being" (M. Kundera, 1985). It has been an extremely productive, encouraging and enriching year that has reminded me of the power of words. I have always known that the pen is mightier than the sword. In 2022, I was able to experience first-hand and with sincere gratitude that words—imbued with information, authenticity and courage—is the sharpest weapon of enlightenment, the most powerful bulwark of truth.

Prior to 2022, I had only ever encountered this level of intensity in the context of my musical work. The correspondence resulting from my writing, the diverse contacts and the numerous

conversations with interesting people of various stripes have further enriched my life. It fills me with an immense feeling of happiness when I am able to experience that the letters that I put down on blank pages, mostly during the detached calm of the night, have an impact, initiate change, generate momentum and trigger processes. Or when I see that the information communicated through texts is absorbed, reflected, verified and multiplied. I believe in free thinking and conceive of ideas as lighthouses, visible from afar in the oppressive fog of a sedating conformism.

So, let's be realistic and try the impossible!

In the spirit of this motto, I am pleased to present a total of 37 texts, articles, essays and polemics written over the past year in this anthology. All are preserved in physical form, on paper, to save them from the digital book burning that permeates the free internet like a malignantly proliferating tumor.

Due to the format of my papers, which are mostly published online, I have refrained from adding footnotes to the book itself (as had been my custom before). All referenced sources or links—and we are talking about a four-digit number for 2022—can be traced at any time via my website, where all texts are available for free download free of charge, numbered and in chronological order as a PDF file (URL: www.regenauer.press/blog).

If ever my website should be offline, a ZIP archive of all texts can be requested at any time by emailing me at regenauer.press@proton.me.

Terms, information and statements that are substantiated or linked to further documents in the original text have been underlined in the book to facilitate the verification of the information about the respective PDF document. I apologize in advance for any redundancies

in references. I have intentionally referenced one or the other piece of information in several articles, as I consider it extremely important.

First, I would like to thank you for helping to preserve my work in analog form for posterity by purchasing this book. After all, "if you want to read in the future, you have to leaf through the past," as André Malraux used to say. Therefore: thank you very much!

With my texts, I hope to be able to represent a well-researched, unfiltered counterpoint to official narratives and propaganda guided by particular interests and to stimulate one or the other constructive discourse. I don't want to proselytize or persuade—I want to contextualize and comment. I would like to share information and knowledge to enable each reader to determine his or her own position by triangulation of all available data. After all, nothing is more important for a fair, inclusive and self-reliant society than open spaces for debate. Only in a constructive examination of all available information, ideas and opinions can sustainable, holistic models of thought emerge. And solutions are only viable if they rest on a broad foundation. Anyone who excludes dissenters, claims the sovereignty of interpretation, censors the media and defames political opponents is acting in a profoundly anti-democratic and—in the literal sense of the word—antisocial way. Because we are *one* human family, *divide and conquer* serves only those who want to dominate. So, I write for everyone and argue with everyone. This is the essence of democracy. A democracy that demonizes pluralism of opinion and prevents a healthy culture of debate is not a democracy.

Tom-Oliver Regenauer

Montagnola, January 2023

Path Into the Unknown

The topic of alternative forms of government and society is one that exudes little charm for those who are disenchanted with politics. At the same time, it would now be necessary to discuss unreservedly in broad terms how things can continue politically after Covid. Otherwise, all our demonstrations will literally come to nothing.

Chaos, murder and manslaughter: these are the first associations many people have when they hear the term "anarchy." Yet this description does not apply in any way to what is meant by the often-misinterpreted term. What most people are quick to call anarchy is called anomie—a complete absence of social norms, rules and order; while anarchy, at its core, stands for the "absence of domination." Just as often, the voter, who is rightly disenchanted with politics, lacks detailed knowledge of grassroots democracy, libertarianism, voluntarism, socialism, communism or even totalitarianism. For some, alternative forms of government and society are only abstract concepts.

That's probably why many people didn't develop concerns about an increasingly authoritarian state until late in life. Autonomy, natural law and spontaneous order probably mean little to many loyal supporters of established parties. Their own democracy is often alien to them, as is the notion of going beyond this construct.

People in the mill of state education have been weaned from the ability to think "out of the box" for decades. Today, however, all political camps are forced to discuss real alternatives to the current system without reservations and with an open mind. In other words, setting off in droves to demonstrate is no longer enough and might lead nowhere.

> **"If we are not smart enough to question authority, how can we be smart enough to engage in a democratic system? Democracies only work when people hold authority figures accountable." (Joss Sheldon)**

The protests against the schizophrenic Covid measures began in the bourgeois spectrum with the proclamation of compulsory vaccination. In thousands of peaceful demonstrations with millions of participants, a broad cross-section of the population expressed its displeasure with the permanent state of emergency and the defamation of heretics and non-conformists. The demonstrators, who represent all strata of society, knew exactly what they were rebelling against.

Nevertheless, even Germany's famous *Montagsspaziergänge* ("walk demonstrations" held every Monday) ended up being a rather inconsequential face-off with the state apparatus, while opposition movements have failed to articulate a vision for the state of affairs after the crisis. For, as Immanuel Kant to aptly noted: "The aimless man suffers his fate. The purposeful one shapes it."

It's easy to be against something. But being for something is much more important if a resistance movement wants to bring about sustainable change. It is now clear to everyone that there will be no return to the old normal, a hope irretrievably destroyed by the unfounded Covid feudalism.

To some extent, that's a good thing. After all, it was the undesirable developments of civil society in the past that made Covid possible in the first place. The breeding ground for the current mass hysteria had been prepared in the past.

This realization holds a unique opportunity for the liberally organized civil society—even though the infantile "new normal" is becoming more and more obscure and repulsive, and the lethal consequences of the crisis policy can no longer be swept under the carpet.

The disruptive nature of the supposed pandemic of the century has not only caused massive cracks in the foundation of society's self-image but has also revealed the weaknesses, criminal energy and authoritarian traits of a seemingly dead system that is trying to hold on to power with all the means at its disposal.

The monster called the State lost its façade, ironically, by initially forcing its citizens to wear masks to signal obedience. Subsequently, the system made it unmistakably clear on several occasions who holds the monopoly on the use of force.

Lockdowns and mask mandates, however, marked only the beginning of a grotesque spectacle of totalitarian pretensions on the part of politics, the state and the corporate economy. Pharma fascism, defamation of critical celebrities and complete ignorance of universally recognized basic and human rights have ultimately led more people than ever to realize who or what actually governs them.

The protest movement is therefore gaining momentum not only nationally. In the meantime, it has developed the global potential to put a stop to the pandemic policy within a manageable time frame and with peaceful protest.

But this will not be the end of technocratic totalitarianism, whose social, digital and financial infrastructure has been prepared, rolled out and, for the most part, already implemented during three mega-events—9/11, the financial crisis and COVID-19.

For effective, continuous changes towards a more humane society, it will therefore not be enough to put an end to the pharmaceutical dictate. This is because the next crisis is just around the corner—and fascist instruments to contain crisis scenarios of all kinds have become law in the meantime. For this reason, it is crucial to discuss across camps where the socio-political and economic journey should go.

It is important to articulate a viable vision of what could come after Covid. To this end, the general and systemic disenchantment with politics must be overcome. After all, a true democracy, like any other participatory form of government, requires political education, personal commitment, social character and the will to critically question one's own positions. This unique opportunity for the global mobilization of the human family against oppression must not be wasted.

> **"You're never going to change things by fighting the status quo. To change something, build a new model that makes the old one obsolete." (Buckminster Fuller)**

It is logical that there is no panacea, no infallible plan for living together in the future. The current situation is unique. It affects the whole world. And every theoretical model of society has advantages and disadvantages, strengths and weaknesses. Pure doctrine does not exist.

No thought leader has leased the absolute truth for himself. For example, libertarian theorists such as Milton Friedman, Ludwig von Mieses, Friedrich Hayek, Karl Popper or Hans-Hermann Hoppe have all formulated promising theses for a free society. However, their ideas must be discussed with representatives of other positions in order to develop an actually feasible approach that will withstand the stress test and the weighing of all concepts, and win a majority of the votes.

For this reason, suggestions from other areas of political and social theory must be considered, as it were. Even if socialist or communist theories in particular stand for more state—which cannot be the solution when the corrupt state is repeatedly the trigger for socio-economic disasters and wars. However, going into detail in this regard would go beyond the scope of this article.

It should be noted that many concepts of human coexistence have not yet progressed beyond the stage of the theoretical construct, even though they deserved to be tried. Others have been tested for practicality to a limited extent throughout history. Most of them, however, failed on their own.

And the numerous successful alternatives to a strong state were soon ended by the very state, so as not to set a positive precedent that could have an effect beyond its time.

Over the centuries, a potpourri of ideas for the golden age of human civilization has emerged. However, each time the same form of social organization has prevailed. A representative feudal rule of the few over the many took shape. It is capital that dominates over the riff raff, whose will is supposedly represented by elections and mandates.

In this respect, hardly anything has changed since the Middle Ages. The constantly intensifying, extreme inequality in the distribution of wealth speaks volumes in this regard. A group of about 6,000 super-rich people owns a large part of the planet, which is a historically unique and by no means desirable state of affairs.

The modern XXL state is also growing incessantly, developing into a centralistic, omniscient, encroaching juggernaut. Intoxicated by its own power, it will never voluntarily give it up. That, at least and if nothing else, is something that history has taught us.

"The clearest symptom of fascist politics is division. Its aim is to divide the population into a "we" and a "them." (Jason Stanley)

Quite a few are convinced that the current crisis can be tackled with new parties and minds. Nevertheless, this is a fallacy. Because in the end, this approach means that one accepts the game of the powerful and subordinates oneself to their framework conditions. Representative democracy, inexorably interwined with corporatism, comprises the playing field of the ruling class—and it sets the rules.

Any party that tries to bring about fundamental changes in this system is doomed to failure from the outset. Because once it is in power, or even just gains influence, it will be corrupted by the same mechanisms and processes to which the beliefs of established parties have fallen victim. It is therefore an imperative to relinquish the previous playing field and embrace new ideas.

The scope of state responsibility urgently needs to be harnessed, namely away from the paternalistic welfare state. Away from the concept of the highly remunerated professional politician who no longer has any connection to the reality of life of his population.

More elements of direct democracy are needed, for which participation is crucially necessary. Terms of office must be drastically reduced. As a first step, the state must be scaled back to its core tasks. Power must emanate from the sovereign, be distributed in a decentralized manner, and be exercised regionally and locally. The pronounced corporatism, now euphemistically referred to as stakeholder capitalism, must also be stopped immediately. Monopolies and oligopolies must be abolished.

Corporations that are driven exclusively by financial interests must be prevented from taking on the tasks of the state.

This applies equally to non-governmental organizations and supranational institutions, as these tend to disregard the legislation and interests of nation states and their populations in an amoral manner.

"Blind belief in authority is the greatest enemy of truth."
(Albert Einstein)

A radical system change cannot happen overnight. Therefore, it would make sense to begin with the democratic framework when initiating change processes. The basic instruments of democracy are familiar to anyone taking part in protest marches.

The introduction of referendums, a constituent assembly and the strengthening of local and regional politics are likewise goals that can be implemented relatively quickly and that could form a foundation for further systemic changes fairly quickly. Changes that benefit the entire species *Homo sapiens*, not just a predestined elite.

From a grassroots democratic state, steps towards decentralized forms of organization could be envisaged. Above all, it is important that the discourse is not led by a select circle of egocentric thought leaders in an ivory tower, but by the broad masses on the street.

In addition to grassroots democratic concepts, libertarian approaches such as those of the so-called private law society seem practicable. In combination with a slimmed-down state system that is as regionally constituted as possible and is primarily responsible for internal and external security, a libertarian model could promise success in the foreseeable future.

Whether and to what extent such a minimal state should also be responsible for social tasks must be determined in the examination of all theories and political currents. To what extent structural elements of direct democracy, minarchy, anarchy, voluntarism or socialism are compatible is the exciting question that must now be answered without prejudice and reservations.

Of course, building consensus is likely to be a challenge. But maybe this path is already the goal. Because if everyone walks it together, instead of being divided by their political ideals, real change has a chance.

One thing is certain: there is not much time left to find out what you want to get involved in. Because the personal freedom of all people is in danger—regardless of the political spectrum. And in the face of globalization and the Fourth Industrial Revolution, it could be the last chance to defend it.

Even though almost all societies have been heteronomously instituted to date, responsible citizens of all camps have long wanted one thing above all else—more self-determination. Political

convictions play a subordinate role in this. After all, everyone is disappointed with top-level politics. Hardly anyone seriously trusts today's demonstrably corrupt state. And categories such as left or right are losing relevance in a minarchical, anarchic, grassroots democratic or private law society. Since the socio-political debate is more regional, it would focus more on elementary issues.

The division induced by top-level politics and the mainstream media would be overcome, and the focus would once again be on social interaction. Therefore, a cross-ideological "roadmap" is needed that outlines a feasible path from the dystopian status quo to utopia. The overarching ideals, namely universal human rights, are essentially shared by all camps that can be taken seriously politically.

It is to be hoped that, in view of the foreseeable failure of the crisis policy, we will soon see a renaissance of reason alongside an end to this division and segregation.

> **"Authoritarianism and rationalism in our sense are irreconcilable, since argumentation, which includes criticism, and the art of listening to criticism, are the basis of reasonableness." (Karl Popper)**

Homo sapiens does not need a strong state in its current form or high-ranking politicians to create an orderly coexistence. The lack of alternatives to today's system is pure illusion. The state education system indoctrinates future generations accordingly and embeds statism, conformism and obedience to authority in the worldview of adolescents.

However, history proves that there is another way. During the Spanish Civil War in the 1930s, for example, large parts of the North were

organized in a completely anarchic way—and thrived nonetheless. In some cases, goods could be purchased at a quarter of the usual cost.

Money had either been abolished or replaced by vouchers. The volume of goods produced was greater than before, and in the anarchic communes, councils or assemblies made unbureaucratic decisions. In addition to the improvement of the economic situation, a spirit of cultural revolution also blew through the country, which replaced traditional forms of intellectual oppression and brought new freedoms.

Similar events have occurred in the recent past in Ukraine, Venezuela, Syria and the free city of Christiania in Copenhagen, which still exists today. All over the world, people are already living in autonomous communities that can survive without government subsidies or intervention. Natural law and spontaneous order ensure that no anomie arises.

A positive aspect of such grassroots democratic, anarchic, libertarian-autonomous or private-law forms of society is that wars become a relic of the past if the model spreads accordingly.

This is because they are always based on institutional politics, on states with sovereign territory, and are unleashed based on territorial claims or financial interests. It wasn't individual villains who killed millions and millions of people in past centuries—it was states, their rulers and financiers.

Therefore, in addition to the form of government, the international fiat financial system must also be replaced in a second step. After all, money is the primary lever of the powerful to exert control over the ordinary citizen. No one needs a global currency or powerful central banks to trade or make a living.

There are plenty of decentralized, independent financial market concepts, especially in the age of cryptocurrencies. In Austria, for example, there are local currencies in almost every federal province that can be used to pay instead of the euro, as reported in a *Die Presse* article in 2011. And in the United States, too, there were a variety of regional currencies before the introduction of today's central banking system.

Not to be neglected is the fact that data has become the gold of modernity. Whoever controls them has power. Accordingly, what applies to the mafia-like central and investment banking system also applies to the digital oligarchy of Silicon Valley. Their supremacy must be limited and the raw material, namely the data, must be placed under the control of the sovereign.

The smaller the units to be managed, the more successful they seem to be. This is underlined by the economic success of small states such as Switzerland. This realization is diametrically opposed to the uninhibited striving for growth of the modern, bloated state and financial system.

Germany, for example, already resembles centrally controlled socialism more so than a federal democracy that is freely constituted and organized under its own accord and responsibility. The state has been interfering in practically all areas of social and economic life not only since Covid.

The political agitation and regulatory mania of the European Union intensify collectivist currents in all member states. As a result, the nation state degenerates into a faceless, unlawful and destitute yet omnipotent bureaucracy, into which the individual has no choice but to merge. Greetings from the politburo.

"There is no such thing as a human communism or a democratic socialism, just as there is no such thing as a vegetarian slaughterhouse." (Guido Westerwelle)

To avoid becoming corrupted by a vacuum of power or ideas, once the Covid regime has run its course, not only the resistance movement but the entire population should already be talking about solutions and defining steps that can lead to a new, humanistic, regionally instituted and as libertarian as possible social order. At the same time, those who still support the government's course of action should likewise be defining how, after the traumatizing events of the past two years, they intend to work constructively with the other side should the neo-capitalist house of cards collapse.

Since previous concepts of social coexistence have always led to the same point, namely catastrophe, it seems that the time has finally come to open up to new, more radical ideas. After all, the fake democracy only represents its own interests. Yes: grassroots democracy does require political education and strong individual engagement. And both are currently in short supply. Minarchy and anarchy have so far been practiced only on a small scale.

While the private law society seems desirable and reasonable, it has remained a theoretical model thus far and is probably alien to most protesters. Modern societies have also had little experience with genuine libertarianism. However, that experience abounds in relation to casino capitalism, dictatorships, socialism and communism—and should therefore not be repeated. Most likely, the private law society needs a new design that meets the requirements of modern man in today's world.

Since natural law and spontaneous order, at least, are reliable basic coordinates, it should be possible to conduct a discussion

from that basis about how individuals, regardless of their ethnic origin, ideology or religion, want to and can live together in the future. Most likely, that vision is not one of an omnipotent state that interferes in every aspect of everyday life, that redistributes wealth from the bottom to the top, and that excludes those who think differently—in return fulfilling hardly any of its obligations to the citizen.

The so-called social contract is no longer worth anything. The Earth is the habitat of all human beings. And all people are equal. The peace-loving human family only needs to regain possession of its common habitat and manage it itself instead of abandoning it to a greedy oligarchy without resistance.

After all, hardly anyone will consider the alternative—a technocratic, transhumanist digital totalitarianism—to be worth living.

Unless the population as a whole articulates in a timely manner a new, feasible vision of the golden age that many social theories have promised but never achieved, protest marches, demonstrations, upheavals and even revolutions will achieve only one thing at the most—old wine in new bottles.

Otherwise, the hamster wheel of human civilization will come to a standstill yet again in exactly the same place in the foreseeable future.

"Those who've achieved all their goals have set them too low." (Herbert von Karajan)

January 8, 2022

28

Parallel World Narrative

Dogmatism and censorship are pillars of the new normal. Interpretive sovereignty is programmatic. With the "Great Narrative," the World Economic Forum is now publishing another megalomaniacal pamphlet that is intended to emphasize elitist visions of digitalized totalitarianism.

"The ultimate goal of any censorship is to allow only those books that no one reads anyway." (Giovanni Guareschi)

There is no censorship. That's right, at least from the point of view of a self-righteous German federal government. After all, from a formal point of view, the state does not get its hands dirty. At least superficially, it adheres to the passage from its Basic Law (constitution). Germany's so-called traffic light coalition, which, according to statements by then-chancellor Olaf Scholz (who is under suspicion of corruption, "ceases to acknowledge any red lines" in the fight against the pandemic, does not censor anyone directly, despite increasingly authoritarian pretensions.

The repressive democracy relies on external forces to enforce its agenda, having nobly delegated the issue of censorship to third parties—namely, a confusing conglomerate of non-state institutions that ensure that unpleasant facts, opinions and people are erased from public perception. In the case that the truth turns out to be obstinate, that democracy will rely on defamation instead of censorship.

In Germany, online pillories such as Correctiv, Psiram, Volksverpetzer and Faktenfuchs are ready to do this job in the spirit of the state system. In this way they resemble Wikipedia, where a not insignificant number of authors have a conspicuous proximity to the state and tend to manipulate the knowledge portal.

Politicians, for their part, simply deflect any criticism and stoically continue with their agenda. No matter how convoluted the responses at a federal press conference may be, no matter how contradictory the statements are, the media repeats the lies and feigns ignorance. No one assumes responsibility. The latter is absconded and the buck is passed on until a given scandal is forgotten or a new one is there to deflect from the last one. The state is sitting out. The dirty work on the internet is done by YouTube, Facebook, Twitter and co.

> **"He who does nothing often does wrong. He who does not forbid injustice, if he can, commands it." (Marcus Aurelius)**

In addition to laws and regulations, German national think tanks such as the Amadeu Antonio Foundation as well as guidelines from the WHO or other supranational bodies determine which content is to be erased by the platform operators. The result of this democratically illegitimate, structural cooperation between the state, the private sector and NGOs forms a corporatist monopoly on information. They have the sovereignty of interpretation over what is presented to the population as reality in the media. It is also they who can claim what is to be considered the absolute truth and nothing but the truth, and, of course, declare something as having been scientifically proven.

The latest meeting of the WEF (World Economic Forum) shows that this phenomenon does not appear out of thin air or arise in

response to unforeseen events. Instead, it is deliberately launched during disruptive crises in order to enforce economic policy goals against the will of the population. At that meeting, it bore the telling working title “The Great Narrative.”

The mission statement and agenda of the meeting, which took place in Dubai from November 10 to November 13, 2021, reveals what the club of the 1,000 most powerful corporations in the world is all about.

Glazed with a sleazy veneer of euphemistic phrases familiar from corporate communications or marketing, the official website of the WEF explains the goals of the annual rendezvous of international corporate oligarchy as follows:

“The Great Narrative Meeting is a linchpin of the Great Narrative initiative, a collaborative effort of the world’s leading thinkers to fashion longer-term perspectives and co-create a narrative that can help guide the creation of a more resilient, inclusive and sustainable vision for our collective future.
Top thinkers from a variety of geographies and disciplines—including futurists, scientists and philosophers—will contribute fresh ideas for the future. Their reflections will be shared in a forthcoming book, The Great Narrative, expected for publication in January 2022.”

This means, in simpler words, that an elite will determine, in a setting behind closed doors, on which sales arguments they agree on, and then develop those communication strategies, formats and forms with which the normal population can be put on the desired course. They seek “manufactured consent.” After all, resistance makes change more expensive. Especially if the change turns out to be exclusively detrimental to the subject to be changed.

For example, the managers of the international oligarchy meet in Davos to draft scripts for the democracy actors in politics and the media. They write stories. And the WEF's last work, *The Great Reset*, was a bestseller.

It was on the market as quickly as the more recently published book *The Great Narrative*. Only three months after the WHO declared the pandemic, the founder of the WEF, Klaus Schwab, together with "co-author" Thierry Malleret, conceived, wrote down and published a new draft of the world. Anyone who knows anything about the literary craft and business knows that this is an extremely ambitious, if not to say unrealistic, period of time, and that *The Great Reset* must therefore have been written some time before the Covid crisis. The same applies to the sequel to Schwab's dystopian Great Reset, *The Great Narrative*, published on January 5, 2022, in which the same authors babble in flowery words about how they envision a better world. An excerpt from the Amazon.com book description encapsulates the book as follows:

"*The book recognizes that the problems for which we collectively must find solutions are both major and manifold. Vital issues abound: economic, environmental, geopolitical, societal and technological. But solutions do exist and are within our grasp. The Great Narrative proposes some hopeful and inspiring narratives around them. In that sense, it is an optimistic book that categorically rejects the negativity that permeates too many doomsday narratives ready to consign us to a future of oblivion.*"

Over the past two years, more and more people have become bitterly disappointed with the institutional forces they formerly trusted and have realized that such phrases are Orwellian newspeak, prompting them to invert their meaning. Although the WEF is not secretive about its essentially inhumane plans for

a supposedly better future—on the contrary, even flaunting them in the book—the billionaires' club has not been met with any broad resistance in the context of their quite obvious implementation. This is because politics not only follows the script from Davos but it is also an integral part of the show, even if it only has a dull supporting role.

No top-tier politician or trade unionist, regarding state sovereignty, is objecting to the claims and encroachments by private companies seeking to obtain institutional functions and assume sovereign tasks. No one in the government is defending democracy against a takeover of power by corporations and capital collectors. No member of parliament is criticizing the obviously criminal cartels.

The only time a disgruntled murmur might be heard in the public debate space is when a liberal voice dares to level criticism against the feudal approach of the billionaires' club that has long perceived itself as equal to the UN, as in-house documents of the WEF suggest.

And indeed, the World Economic Forum now probably has more influence than the international confederation of nations based in New York. After all, as a vehicle for implementing global governance based on the Anglo-American model, largely initiated by Henry Kissinger and founded by his protégé Klaus Schwab in the 1970s as a management symposium, has nearly unlimited access to money and power.

The UN, on the other hand, is financially dependent. It is under the thumb of the corporatist system. The latter is what keeps it alive, in order to, on the basis of the economic interests of the corporations, see to the development of guidelines for global action and their imposition on nation states by means of undemocratic

processes. The illustrious circle of the most important financiers of the United Nations is, of course, recruited from the circle of Schwab's imperialist clique.

A detailed article by Johnny Vetmore for *Unlimited Hangout* from February 20, 2021 discusses the dark family history of the networker, who was born in Ravensburg in 1938, and sheds light on Schwab's father's Nazi collaboration. Vetmore's careful research lays out that this German family's efforts to gain influence were driven not only by economic advantages but also by political interests that were permeated by eugenics.

Benito Mussolini would be proud of Schwab and his ilk. For they fulfill the former Duce's ideas of a modern dictatorship, about which the former tyrant of Italy said:

> **"Corporatism is a more accurate term for the ideal form of fascism."**

Meetings such as "The Great Narrative" and the publications of the WEF prove in black and white that scripts, narratives and emotions are more important than traditional value systems, facts, rationality and reason to assert geostrategic interests. They also show that the respective state response patterns to crises are no coincidence. These usually slumber in the background, ready for use when chaos breaks loose. After all, in the slipstream of the state of emergency, even unpopular projects can be implemented. Covid is perhaps the ideal case in point of this state of affairs. During the Covid years, some 190 governments operated in unison with nearly identical measures. Their communication strategies and content, too, were nearly identical, together amounting to an international canon of oppression.

Predictive planning and insider knowledge of crisis profiteers have been implied by strategy papers, such as the Rockefeller Foundation's lockstep scenario of 2009, and simulation games such as Event 201, which a few months before the start of the pandemic rehearsed precisely those scenarios that subsequently dominated the lives of the entire world population for two years. The same applies to the Cyber Polygon exercise, which simulates a massive failure of digital infrastructure—something that has not yet occurred but that has a high probability of occurring. Astonishingly, reality often adapts to the fictitious content of the various disaster control exercises at short notice.

Nevertheless, the average citizen finds it difficult to believe that a global event like Covid-19 could be centrally planned and controlled.

Even if the actions of the states seem surprisingly homogeneous and synchronized, people are more likely to attribute this to an overreaction on the part of the WHO or their governments rather than acknowledging that crises and wars are quite wanted by those in power, and that their instrumentalization is, therefore, planned long in advance. Malicious intent seems inconceivable, and global coordination is deemed impossible.

Nevertheless, the management of the state system resembles that of a large corporation. The CEO of an industrial giant may well control hundreds of thousands of employees, dozens of national companies, shareholders, politicians, lobby associations, trade unions and media around the world—all hierarchically organized.

This is achieved by means of aggressive legal departments, an armada of consulting firms, sophisticated communication

strategies, change management projects, advertising and image campaigns—and above all with a lot of money. In addition, such undertakings benefit from loans and subsidies and involve bribery or black money, going with the flow of whatever financial streams are in place. Nothing else makes politics.

Modern totalitarianism must create a parallel media world, an illusory reality that legitimizes its existence and actions. Much like in business, it has to aggressively promote its "product," because its client base has been running away from it for decades. It has squandered any trust it had enjoyed.

This is proven by surveys conducted in Germany prior to the current crisis, which clearly showed that hardly anyone was really believing in the state system anymore. Subsequently, the system, much like a market strategist, developed communication tools to retain its customers, among them the so-called Panik Papier. The United States, Great Britain, France and other countries has similar government strategy papers. Because, if enthusiasm isn't enough, the state resorts to fearmongering to keep the masses under its spell.

Anyone who has a basic knowledge of history is aware of this.

Such a grand narrative, however, is a costly affair. Never in history have governments spent so much money on self-promotion and propaganda as they have since the pandemic was declared. In the United Kingdom, for example, government spending on advertising increased by a staggering 238 percent in 2020—to a total of 164 million British pounds, as reported by *The Drum* in an article on March 23, 2021. Similar figures can be found for all countries that have been hit by government marketing offensives under the Covid regime.

The German government also spent a total of 150 million euros on advertising in 2020 (source: Statista). In this way, vast sums of taxpayers' money flowed to big tech via the state. As if Silicon Valley hadn't already benefited enough from the artificially exacerbated crisis.

The system imposed a media reality that had nothing to do with the reality of life of the population, with democracy or with a social market economy.

This forcefulness resembles a DAX company that wants to sell its product at any price and with penetrating, misleading advertising. It also resembles a pharmaceutical company called Pfizer, which had already been prosecuted 75 times for criminal activities but could still convince the consumer to take its Covid injections. However, the process only works if the background noise of critical voices does not become too loud.

Corporations like to settle escalating product liability issues discreetly via out-of-court settlement payments, image campaigns and the like. The state, which must maintain its legitimacy at all costs, is under pressure in this regard. The system and its executive branch must act morally, at least on the surface. On the one hand, a government must not give the impression that it is acting anti-democratically, and must not create headlines and images that allow comparison with fascist systems. On the other hand, the state cannot allow the waves of criticism to become so high that they undermine its foundation—the unconditional belief in its necessity.

This engenders, always under the pretext of having to counter potential threats to democracy, a set of rules that are hostile to freedom. Among these are Germany's Network Enforcement Act, of which a tightening is slated to come into effect on February 1, 2022.

The act was sharply criticized from the outset, because numerous data protectionists expressed massive concerns about potential abuse of the legal trick. As recently as January 2019, the media outlet *heise.de* reported in an article that critics' fears had not yet been confirmed and that there had been no "overblocking" thus far. After all, platforms like YouTube were still "deleting" "moderately" at the time. The article then complained, between the lines, that not enough hate speech was being removed from the internet—and quoted Green politicians who see no danger of abuse or censorship in the state's legal armament against freedom of expression, on the contrary, even calling for a tightening of the law.

The fact that the admonishers were to be proved right in the end was vividly demonstrated in 2020, when YouTube deleted around two million channels within one quarter alone because the official narrative saw itself endangered by well-founded criticism.

The purpose of any expansion of power is to be applied. The normative goals of individual projects are often obscure at first, and sub-projects are ignored. It is only with time and in the sum of their individual results that small, often irreversible steps taken by the state give an idea of the overarching strategy underlying the individual projects.

The German Infection Protection Act, for example, received little attention initially yet eventually served the federal government finally in degrading fundamental rights to privileges. The think tanks financed by the hegemonic powers have a broad planning horizon. They transform the strategies of their sponsors into national legislation in periods of time that are difficult to predict, and do so through non-transparent, supranational institutions and processes. It is thanks to this approach that the free internet became a monopolized and monitored platform economy within a decade.

Regular online cleanups are just one of the symptoms of the tumor that has thrived on the world wide web. More and more renowned scientists, doctors, journalists and artists are falling victim to the internet Inquisition, the digital burning of Alexandrian libraries. With the disappearance of their websites, documents, channels, videos and tweets, we lose important information, clues and evidence.

The system makes an immense technical effort to block access to unwanted content. Recent victims of internet censorship enforced by the platform oligarchy include Dr. Robert Malone, highly endowed scientist and developer of mRNA technology, and Henryk M. Broder, a respected publicist. Their crime: freedom of expression.

Dr. Malone had shown based on serious data that the protective effect of vaccination, in other words, its benefits, does not exceed the apparently high risk of unforeseeable side effects. As a result, his Twitter account was suspended shortly before the turn of the year.

However, in a conversation with podcast star Joe Rogan on December 30, 2021, Malone was able to present his findings in a noteworthy, two-and-a-half-hour program just one day after his excommunication by big tech—and thereby outsmart censorship, as *Die Weltwoche* put it on January 2, 2022. Joe Rogan's show is the most successful podcast in the world and now reaches more people than CNN.

Especially when it comes to the sacrosanct mRNA injection, the side effects of which can hardly be relativized, especially in the United States, where new leaks and scandals around Anthony Fauci and the CDC (Center for Disease Control) are

constantly coming to light. In his latest book, *The Real Anthony Fauci*, Robert F. Kennedy meticulously examined the background of this topic.

Henryk M. Broder is also accused of having made critical comments about the Covid policy in one of his videos, as reported by the media outlet achgut.com, which he manages as editor.

YouTube subsequently deleted achgut.com's entire channel. Months earlier, the channels of Boris Reitschuster (a former correspondent of the German magazine *Focus*), who had over 300,000 subscribers, and those of investigative journalist James Corbett, who likewise enjoyed a huge audience, had been put on hold—like thousands of other critical voices before and after them. But the clumsy elimination of non-conformist content is not even the biggest problem.

> **"The enemy is self-censorship. In a free society, it is a great danger if you are so afraid that you censor yourself." (Tim Robbins)**

Punish one, educate thousands. Mao already knew that. Thus, just as direct censorship is a cancer that metastasizes its way into society, so the censorship we inflict on ourselves. Critics adapt the way they phrase things, stop using certain terms, circumvent topics to avoid being bullied and cancelled from the public sphere. Meanwhile, the behavior of the opinion-forming mainstream media is paving the way for forgetting the future.

Since today's children and grandchildren won't even know what to miss in the future, they will never have the chance to fight for something worth fighting for in this increasingly likely dystopia of digital totalitarianism. Not only the present but also the past is

optimized. The digital space is programmed to reflect the narrative and retell the reality curated by the system.

The faceless empire's allergic defensive reactions to any non-conformism are exemplified by the storm of indignation generated in the mainstream media because an unvaccinated Novak Djokovic wants to enter Australia to participate in the Australian Open—tested negative, mind you and in compliance with the regulations. Nevertheless, the verdict of the public pillory was that he was an egoist, as *Spiegel* author Peter Ahrens immediately commented on January 10, 2022. This constitutes a textbook case of character assassination and framing, in this case based on a highly personal and subjective risk assessment of one of the world's greatest tennis players.

The omnipresent protectionism by politics and the mass media of a hegemonic narrative is reminiscent of medieval witch hunts, which also sacrificed animals and children to their religious delusion in blind frenzy.

After all, even institutional churches have always functioned like a hierarchically organized corporation that seeks to spread its product—in this case the individual exegesis of the Holy Scriptures. They did so by all means, and if necessary with deceit, armed force and manipulation of adepts, followers and subordinates, as not only the Crusades have shown. The "new normal" narrative is also based on mass psychosis and cognitive dissonance, as Dr. Robert Malone diagnosed in the conversation with Joe Rogan.

Legitimacy, power and mass hysteria are fueled by the disorientation and lack of will of the ruled. This is what modern feudalism is all about when, instead of rational, democratically legitimized,

political programs, it proclaims arrogant scripts and narratives to enforce elitist utopias of an inhumane transhumanism.

> **"This dissolution of the concrete individual in a moral whole is almost an invitation to usurpers to act as representatives of this whole and to ignore the real desires of men in the name of the whole, even to suppress them in the name of true freedom." (Isaiah Berlin)**

The facts that have been investigated suggest that resistance to the inhumane pandemic policy only makes sense if it moves outside the narrative that has been launched. Criticism of the narrative itself, or within the guardrails of the illusory reality created by the official narrative, vanishes into thin air without any effect.

This is because opposition and headwinds in the defined debate space are factored in. Every good manager does this when he plans changes that are to the detriment of the workforce or shareholders.

A communication plan consolidates potential risks that may arise within the framework of a project, weighs and prioritizes them according to the probability of occurrence in order to be able to fall back on standardized processes that were defined prior to the start of the project at the beginning of the event.

It is no coincidence that the participants in the various pandemic simulations that have taken place over the past decade all had training in dealing with fake news, social media criticism, critical celebrities and influencers, resistance and social unrest.

If the technocratic-hegemonic oligarchy works successfully with narratives, even when the facts speak against it, then the

opposition might do well to copy this strategy, seeing that it works. How else can you explain that a system that appeals to the environmental conscience of its citizens is taken seriously, despite insisting, at the same time, that airlines such as Lufthansa complete 18,000 empty flights so as not to jeopardize take-off and landing rights? These are among the perverse excesses of a socialist-tinged turbo-capitalism that carries concepts such as environmental protection, nuclear phase-out and sustainability like a badge, but never follows its words with deeds.

The example shows that the attempt to curb the effect of official narratives is nearly impossible, since the state and corporate media (still) have too much reach and influence. However, with a clever communication plan, the opposition could generate more public momentum. After all, a synchronized approach of all critical movements would ensure more visibility and acceptance among the population as a whole—provided that peaceful protests, homogeneous communication and a generally understandable, positive message is conveyed.

This could be based on a socio-political vision that builds ideological bridges and combines grassroots democratic elements with libertarian approaches and a social market economy, and that can be realized in a timely manner. In fact, in another publication of mine, I had suggested a corresponding cross-party discourse.

Those who are able to paint a more attractive picture of an achievable future and vividly depict each step along the way will have more popularity in the long term. Neither “The Great Reset” nor “The Great Narrative” promises a rosy future for ordinary people, regardless of their salary bracket or where on the political spectrum they find themselves.

Not everyone sees this yet. But even the most visually stunning Hollywood blockbuster movie won't inspire in the long run if the script isn't any good. Some movies you just don't want to see a second time. That's why now is the time to write our narrative together, our stories for the social togetherness of tomorrow. The utopia of normal people. The more beautiful stories. Because rarely have the chances been better that one of them will become reality.

"Great minds discuss ideas, average minds discuss events, weak minds discuss people." (Socrates)

44 Mao, Yale and Hegemony

Politicians paint an ambivalent picture of the Middle Kingdom. First as a totalitarian regime, then as a prime example of efficiency and prosperity. These are two narratives. But what role does China play in the geopolitical monopoly?

"The illegal we do immediately; the unconstitutional takes a little longer." (Henry Kissinger, WikiLeaks)

We can consider Mao Zedong to be a de facto an alumnus of Yale, America's training ground for the elite. Even though he did not officially study or earn his doctorate there, he was editor-in-chief of the university's magazine *The New Human*, published by Yale-China (formerly Yale-in-China). The university was founded in 1913, eight years before the founding of the Chinese Communist Party, an anecdote that Yale proudly documents in an article by Jonathan Spence in the *Yale Daily News* from May 5, 1967. In the article, Spence points out that Mao accepted an official invitation from the Americans and that influential circles decided, for unspecified reasons, to support the unknown demagogue.

This came after Mao's first attempt to spread communist ideas in the form of a weekly newspaper in his Chinese homeland had failed. Mao thus gratefully accepted the offer and made the Yale-in-China publication the mouthpiece of his political theses.

As Jonathan Spence's article discusses, the magazine's focus shifted drastically with Mao's takeover of the editorial board. From this point on, the paper devoted itself to social criticism and "thought reorientation," which is a euphemism for manipulation.

But that's not all. Yale-in-China also financed the young Mao Zedong's first bookstore. Since the future leader of the People's Republic of China was destitute, Yale provided him with three rooms. Within a short time, the ambitious communist managed to open seven more branches and thus made a significant contribution to the financing of the Communist Party and the Socialist Youth Movement by selling Marxist literature. From then on, the career of what is believed to be the greatest mass murderer of all time took off.

At first, it is difficult to imagine why Jonathan Spence *proudly* points out in his article that Mao Zedong would probably never have become what he was without Yale's involvement. This is because when the text appeared in the *Yale Daily News*, the tyrant already had millions of people on his conscience, directly or indirectly. Depending on how you read it, between 42 and over 100 million deaths can be attributed to the Yale protégé, as Global. Security.org discusses in a detailed analysis.

And the relations of the elite university and its fabled student fraternities with China go even deeper, as Yale enthusiastically reports on its own website.

People like to look back on a common history with the Middle Kingdom. Thus, with one exception, all US ambassadors to China were members of a student union at Yale. For example, George H. W. Bush was appointed by Gerald Ford as the chief diplomat

of the United States in the People's Republic in 1974 and became head of the CIA two years later.

However, Yale was not the only organization to maintain close ties with China.

As reported by a Chinese news outlet, a report published by Bloomberg identified a network of a total of 103 people from the eight most influential families in China who studied at US universities such as Harvard, Stanford or Princeton, and who maintained close ties later in life, both professionally and privately. This occurred via influential positions in their home country, such as politicians, board members of cooperating companies, at the diplomatic level and in the context of marriages within the network. As a result, the Chinese elite can be said to have received its university education primarily from the supposed class enemy.

After the proclamation of the People's Republic by Mao Zedong on October 1, 1949, China was isolated for a long time. It was only with the death of the godlike dictator that the world's most populous country began to open up. US President Richard Nixon took credit for initiating the first trade relations after visiting the country in 1972. But it was the controversial Henry Kissinger, regarded by many as a war criminal, who established contact with the Chinese leadership in advance and traveled to Beijing in 1972 to negotiate the so-called "Shanghai Communiqué."

In return, the US-China Business Council "honored" the most important negotiator of the United States on the occasion of its 40th anniversary. Exactly one year after Kissinger's visit to China, this non-transparent council, led by top managers of the corporate cartels, began its work. This work certainly benefitted

from Kissinger's intervention and a financial injection from his greatest patron, David Rockefeller, the most influential financial magnate of his generation, who died in 2017. Indeed, it was the top banker who hired Kissinger to establish contacts with China and develop economic ties.

Rockefeller had discovered the young Henry Kissinger in the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), another organization of the American upper class operating away from the public eye. The German counterpart to the CFR is the Atlantik-Brücke association. After Kissinger had initially taken on tasks for the CFR, Rockefeller took him under his wing himself, finding an unscrupulous and capable confidant in the Harvard graduate who was born in Fürth, Germany, in 1923. From then on, Kissinger loyally helped the publicity-shy financial mogul to realize the controversial goals of his super-rich clan up until the end of his life. And those goals were by no means modest, or philanthropic.

"Power is the greatest aphrodisiac." (Henry Kissinger)

The Rockefeller empire had stretched out its tentacles towards China long before any political envoys had done so. The family, originally from Germany and whose roots can be traced back to the seventeenth century, has been remarkably involved in the country of the "democratic dictatorship of the people" since the beginning of the twentieth century, as documented on the homepage of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund.

The industrial magnate John D. Rockefeller, born in 1839, provided the funding for a school in China as early as 1917. Described as the richest American of all time, he initially laid the foundation for his family empire with fraudulent snake oil deals before making a name for himself in the world's third-largest country (by area)

around the time the Communist Party was founded—surely just a coincidence.

Another "coincidence" would be that the prime real estate property on the East River, on which the main building of the United Nations in New York stands, was a donation from the Rockefellers.

And presumably, neither the UN nor the WHO would have been founded without the philanthropically hyperactive family.

After all, no one else was so early and massively committed to the topic of globalization. In the spirit of the Rockefellers, this might more aptly be called world domination. In an article published on May 11, 2013, *The Lancet* emphasizes that no one has had more influence in the field of global health in the past 100 years than the Rockefeller Foundation. The archive of the family organization, which began in 1910, provides an impressive overview of the spheres of influence that the clan has opened up in just under a century. Financial contributions to China are conspicuously frequent and early. Moreover, the archive lists that are accessible only those types of events that put those donating to the charity in a positive light in the public sphere.

David Rockefeller, the patriarch's successor, also showed great sympathy for the People's Republic early on, praising Mao's leadership in a newspaper article and describing "the social experiment of the Chinese as one of the most important and successful in human history."

Coming from the then chairman of the board of directors of the Chase Manhattan Bank—a figurehead of the capitalist system—whose fortune was estimated at 3.5 billion US dollars at the time of his death, this sounds strange at first.

However, if one considers the economic ties between the United States and China that have existed for a century in the context of the socio-economic developments of the recent past, such statements make perfect sense. Ideologies, nationalism or humanistic values have never played a role for big business. Money knows no morals.

No sooner had Henry Kissinger, on behalf of Rockefeller, arranged for a trade agreement with the communist regime to be concluded, then the Chase Manhattan Bank hosted a meeting at its own local offices attended by representatives of the world's 300 most important corporations.

They analyzed which sectors of the Chinese economy were most likely to open up the market and invest accordingly, at least officially. This marked the beginning of a rapid development in the mid-1970s that has intensified continuously over the past 50 years. Although China is often denounced on the international political stage and in the mass media for its human rights violations, behind the scenes of the media narrative, the superpowers are forging economic-symbiotic ties.

The supranational, economic and technological ties between the two states have been deepening for half a century now. Since the first trade agreement, technical know-how has been flowing to China, especially from America, as reported by the *Washington Post* in 1998, for example, when it became known that secret space technology had been illegally transferred to the People's Republic.

The following year, the US Bureau of Export Administration provided a detailed study of the potential security implications of the largely covert technology transfers and the vast sums of

money that US corporations and the international oligarchy are shifting to China.

"America has no permanent friends or enemies, only interests." (Henry Kissinger)

In the West, the strategy of shifting capacity to China is justified by cost reductions and passing on reduced production costs to the consumer. But this argument only makes sense at first glance. On closer inspection, the figures raise the question of why so much is being invested, especially in the area of research and development (R&D).

If it were only a matter of low wages and lax labor laws, priority would be given to relocating production capacities, outsourcing piecework or using the country as an extended workbench. We think only of Apple, whose supplier Foxconn has been criticized for years for inhumane working conditions. Nevertheless, since the 1970s, the military-industrial and digital-financial complexes have invested billions in cost-intensive research sites in the People's Republic—and thus developed the technological infrastructure over the decades with which the communist regime now efficiently oppresses and monitors the population.

China has the most regulated internet in the world. In the cities, every nook and cranny is monitored by cameras. In the countryside, it will soon be like this. Artificial Intelligence (AI) identifies everyone within seconds and records mobility and camera data, emotional states, as well as all smartphone inputs. There is no privacy.

Companies are required by law to transfer all user data to the state, which manages its subjects with a sophisticated social

credit system. This is developed with money and know-how from Americans and Europeans. Anyone who violates the rules is publicly humiliated and excluded from social life, as has become clear since the introduction of Germany's so-called 2G+ rule.

The totalitarian system in China has dehumanized *Homo sapiens*, merging it into a faceless, collective masse of uniform beings who allow themselves to be controlled by machines and applications. In the People's Republic, it has already reached the point where criminals will soon be sentenced by a virtual prosecutor. AI makes the verdict based on existing documents, data and statements of the accused.

If one looks at the described historical developments and processes as well as the current geopolitical positioning of the People's Republic of China from the point of view of an entrepreneur or researcher, one could grasp the working hypothesis that China functions as a cross-generational pilot project or test laboratory for a totalitarian model of society that is not (yet) applied anywhere else on the planet.

From a geo-economic perspective and in a historical context, it is by no means far-fetched or unique that US capital contributes to the rise of economic, state and social forms that are diametrically opposed to its own supposedly democratic values. For example, Prescott Sheldon Bush, the father of George H. W. Bush, alongside other influential Wall Street bankers supported the Nazi Party and Adolf Hitler—until they were forced by the US government to give up business relations with the Nazis after Pearl Harbor.

The British *The Guardian* had taken up the topic in an article from September 25, 2004, which, although thorough, was nevertheless

all to lenient with Prescott Bush. Still, the example shows that such conspiratorial business practices are neither fiction nor coincidence but instead financially motivated cartel formation and market manipulation that can permanently change the geopolitical status.

Russia's history is not freer from the influence of the hegemonic financial and corporate oligarchy than the Arab or Asian world. The immense influence of the US financial industry on the world's largest country, the former Soviet Union, was reported by *Technocracy News* in an August 8, 2018 article, citing the even more detailed analysis on the subject by Professor Antony Sutton, who provides astonishing details and evidence in his book *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution*.

From the mid-1990s to the year 2000, the international banking cartel also had its fingers in the pie when it used appropriate influence to ensure the re-election of Boris Yeltsin. The scandal was later exposed and became known in Russia as the "Seven Bankers. Nevertheless, Yeltsin remained president, to the advantage of globalized high finance.

Processes and connections of this kind marked by corruption can be documented in abundance for the past century. And even though countless books have been written on the subject, the same oligarchic structures as at the beginning of the twentieth century continue to set the tone.

There is hardly a crisis or war in which international high finance has not used the situation to its advantage and taken steps to further monopolize and centralize its power. Wars, in particular, even civil wars, are a fantastic business for corporations, banks and governments in a perverted way.

The preparation and execution of military operations as well as reconstruction devour a lot of money—and thus ensure long-term dependence on the never-ending flow of capital from the essentially criminal central and commercial banking system, which creates fictitious value out of thin air through the creation of money, so-called book money, for which it subsequently claims fees and interest. The system may also claim real capital, for example, the house of a defaulter should he fail to meet his installment payments. Basically, this is cheating, or a Ponzi scheme, as *WirtschaftsWoche* describes it in an article by Thorsten Polleit from 2015.

"War is the mere continuation of politics by other means."
(Carl von Clausewitz)

Military conflicts have always been used to shift geopolitical lines and reorganize the international order. The most recent example is NATO's hidden eastward expansion via Ukraine.

Alleged provocations on the part of Vladimir Putin are simply tales. For months, NATO has been engaged in anti-Russian agitation, organizing military exercises near the Russian border and invading the country's territorial waters.

The alleged build-up of Russian troops on the Ukrainian border is, as reported by the *Anti Spiegel*, pure propaganda of the Western military alliance, which is obviously aiming for a hot war with Putin. There is no other way to interpret NATO's actions in recent months. Thus, on January 19, 2022, the Biden administration announced that it would provide Ukraine with an additional $200 million for defense purposes.

And on the very same day, *DER SPIEGEL* already dared to ask whether there could still be a solution without war. The choice of

linguistic means raises clear doubts as to who is the aggressor in this conflict. For his part, Vladimir Putin appears calm, reflective and objective in press conferences, in contrast to the war rhetoric of the Western Allies.

Economist and former hedge fund manager Alex Krainer, who uses AI to create detailed financial market analyses and forecasts across all industries, sees striking parallels in comparing current transaction patterns and market data with those from before the Second World War—and thus supports the thesis that a hot war could be imminent.

Geostrategically, the focus is currently on three actors: the so-called Western world (the NATO member states) and their supposed adversaries China and Russia. The Arab world has been destabilized by secret services and invasions, Africa has been plundered by colonialism and turbo-capitalism in the truest sense of the word.

It seems logical that, in the light of the findings discussed above, it can be assumed that today's constellation is not based solely on coincidences.

This is because the current arrangement has advantages for institutions and bodies whose success does not depend on the development of national ambitions. The powerful capital collectors who lived up to the adage "money rules the world" in the last century regard the entire globe as their game board. Or as their property.

This is proven not only by figures, as documented by ETH Zurich in a highly acclaimed paper from 2011, but also by the own works and words of people such as David Rockefeller, who clearly spoke

out in favor of a world government and the Chinese model of society in his memoirs.

According to the ETH results, Rockefeller's company JP Morgan Chase still ranks sixth among the most influential financial institutions in the world and is still the largest bank in the United States in terms of total assets. The question arises as to how the current constellation of NATO, China and Russia is to be classified geopolitically. Cui bono?

The current constellation of the three blocks risks moving Russia into focus with a military conflict and to intensify global tension while at the same time, and comparatively unnoticed, allowing for an across-the-board implementation of the social credit system developed and perfected in China. And this is occurring in the slipstream of a crisis that is being financed and backed by the very supranational institutions that were created by the financial oligarchy after the Second World War. Among these are the IMF, World Bank, WHO, BIS and CFR, to name just a few. Thus, in the wake of the supposed health emergency of the past two years, the largest redistribution of capital in the history of mankind took place. The direction of financial flows, however, is identical to that of all modern democracies: from the bottom to the top, which is where the Chinese model promises absolute power.

China's social credit system, although publicly mocked by Western politicians, has long been installed in our country. For the time being, it is still called a Covid certificate, Green Pass or vaccine passport in the West. However, the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research is becoming more semantically clear. It is presently conducting a study that deals with a "bonus system" for citizens, as examined in a query by representatives of DIE LINKE party on August 11, 2021. In view of the international net-zero

efforts, it seems certain that individual CO_2 consumption will be used as a yardstick for sanctions in such a system.

Whatever you might call the QR code readers and monitoring instruments, and whatever codes or key figures they evaluate, it takes little imagination to imagine how quickly a seemingly harmless, digital infrastructure for pandemic control can become a totalitarian tool through which citizens can be controlled in all areas of life. China is leading the way.

And while the fragile plague narrative is slowly losing its impact, sequels have already been devised, as I explained in my last text. The goals that the digital-financial complex and big pharma wanted to achieve have been achieved. This is because the IT infrastructure required for modern totalitarianism was installed worldwide in the wake of Covid and can now be activated for any crisis. Already today, it is hardly possible to travel to the United States, Colombia, Israel, Costa Rica, Puerto Rico or Australia without proof of an injection. If you can't demonstrate at least obedience, you won't fly with us. And at some point, perhaps, there will be an infinite crisis or permanent war.

Even George Orwell considered this to be a model for maintaining power when he described, in his seminal *1984,* how the all-powerful system constantly reports on horrific war on distant fronts—a battle between Oceania, Eurasia and East Asia—but how the actual existence of this war can never be actually perceived, experienced or verified. And because the three blocks are militarily absolutely equivalent, the conflict is an endless loop with which the system permanently legitimizes itself in totalitarianism.

War is peace. It is not without a certain gallows humor that even today there are three large blocs that, according to the official interpretation, want to divide the planet among themselves.

In the coming years, we can expect the Covid apps to be used for other purposes, and to be expanded to include identity card and driver's license. Later on, bank account, criminal record and carbon footprint will also be integrated. All this will be done on the smartphone, which will also serve to pay for purchases, since there won't be any cash any longer. What we might then see are scenarios where people who've bought steak a few times too often will be informed by their pocket spy that their Tesla will be deactivated for three days, seeing that they've used up all their carbon credit on the "citizen bonus system." At the same time, they won't be able to charge their battery, and they'll be restricted to move within radius of 100 meters around their place of residence. If the 100-meter limit is exceeded, a penalty payment is automatically authorized from the central bank account on the mobile app. A technocratic nightmare.

In a short text on this topic, Dr. Karim Fathi, researcher for conflict management and resilience promotion, vividly describes what working life could look like after the introduction of such a dystopian control mechanism.

In this context, it is hardly surprising that Klaus Schwab and the World Economic Forum (WEF) also have close ties to China. The Chinese elite is a regular participant in the meetings of the Davos imperialist circle.

The son of the WEF founder, Olivier M. Schwab, has a Chinese wife and was managing director of the WEF subsidiary in China from 2012 to 2015.

They maintain close contacts with the Middle Kingdom and rarely hold back with expressions of sympathy. On the other hand, what is less known is that the Bank for International Settlements (BIS), the world's most powerful financial institution based in Basel (CH), whose employees enjoy diplomatic immunity, has been working with China for a long time.

However, a meeting agenda from 2013 shows that globalization and inflation management were already the focus of the BIS, the central bank of central banks, and the People's Bank of China.

The cooperation between these two bodies is particularly relevant in view of the upcoming launch of central bank digital currencies (CBDCs). Here, too, China serves as the West's most important pilot project. In IT, it would be called a "sandbox," understood as a training environment, a replica of reality, that might still contain some major bugs before the corrected code is transported to the primary system after a few test runs.

The People's Republic has already issued its digital yuan to part of the population and will gradually roll out the electronic currency nationwide in order to ultimately replace cash and obtain total control. In the future, the digital means of payment may be subject to an expiry date or certain geographical restrictions. Every transaction is traceable.

Private financial transactions are a thing of the past. It's hard to imagine black markets and drug markets without cash. And free cryptocurrencies will be undermined by regulation once the CBDC is introduced.

In the Bahamas, they are even further ahead than in China. In terms of the size of the country, however, the CBDC project there

is not comparable to Europe, which is why the ECB says it is trying to "draw inspiration from the Chinese project."

The Bank for International Settlements (BIS) has also already done a great job with Project Helvetia and has prepared itself for the digital franc and its role as a hub between the currency zones, as a short image video on the company's website shows.

Digital money is about to be launched globally. It is the most visible indication of Huxley's metaphor of the prison without bars, of which he said in Berkeley in 1953 that people will eventually choose it voluntarily, no longer even able to perceive their own prison. That's where we are.

And indeed, surveys of the Chinese population show that the majority of them are satisfied with the social credit system, presumably because the population feels safe with the system or doesn't know anything about it. At the same time, negative or critical answers to the survey were probably suppressed. Either point to a gloomy situation.

In view of the information laid out, the initial working hypothesis that China serves as a testing ground for a totalitarian model of society can be considered probable. As a result, further conclusions emerge.

After all, China is demonstrably not a hostile power on the geopolitical playing field, but a pilot project of influential globalists who, since the beginning of the twentieth century, have been promoting the development of the supposed archenemy with clear objectives.

Over the decades, Western democracies have helped the authoritarian regime in Beijing build the surveillance infrastructure that is now being used to oppress and bully the Chinese people.

In addition, they have become dependent on the People's Republic for supply chains. If China ever stops exporting, the world market will collapse. Certain products and medicines such as penicillin are almost exclusively produced in China. As recently as September 2019, NBC News had reported on the danger of China's monopolization of certain product groups.

Meanwhile, the Covid crisis is being instrumentalized to gradually roll out the social model, including the social credit system, developed in China worldwide. In stage one it was disguised as contact tracing.

The infrastructure for checking QR codes installed in the context of the supposed pandemic will be expanded according to the Chinese model and used for the automated evaluation of a person's social reputation. The CBDC tested in the People's Republic is also a test run, a dry run, to replace the existing fiat financial system in a timely manner, seeing that it was on the verge of collapse for the third time in ten years at the end of 2019.

This paradigm shift will be initiated either in the wake of steadily rising inflation or due to a financial market crash. The latter option would be favored by control-hungry elitists, since digital money could also be used to introduce a universal basic income (subject to state conditions), which would create all the more dependence on the system.

The declared goal of the financial oligarchy is a global single currency—and even if national currencies were preserved after

a financial market crash, the BIS's new CBDC management would make a global single currency a de facto reality. This is because the BIS will book all transactions in a reserve currency.

Anglo-American big business is also what made Russia what it is today. The country serves two purposes: One, as a villain, capturing the media attention of the masses so that controversial plans can go unnoticed and giving China more room to expand. Or, secondly, the global hegemony is envisioning more profound changes for the European continent and is provoking a hot war with Putin by means of an escalating NATO alliance case.

Ideologies such as capitalism or communism have long since ceased to be at stake. Political ideas, forms of government, governments or social norms are irrelevant for the implementation of global governance, since it is constituted supranationally and thus beyond democratic control.

The primary driver behind a large number of globalist projects as well as the biggest beneficiary of all wars, crises, disasters and paradigm shifts are the financial cartels, which have historically been demonstrably sowing corruption for over a century and establishing monopoly structures to expand their supremacy.

To this end, regimes of any nature are built up and disempowered at will. The erosion of nation states is beneficial to these groups, as they seek to implement a collectivist monoculture. This far-reaching process is visible to everyone living in the world's metropolises, where the inner cities have become uniformized by the exact same internationally operating companies: Starbucks, Citibank, McDonalds, Apple, Hilton and Nike.

The above description of geopolitical events and correlations can, of course, only scratch the surface of the huge and complex field of geopolitics. However, the information referenced offers a veritable pool of cross-references that allows for further reading. And it is often the past that offers more answers to questions of the present than the present itself. Based on the conclusions reached, it seems particularly remarkable that new elections or a reform of what is commonly understood as democracy are not enough to enable humanity to lead a self-determined life in the long term. Economic aspects are likewise negligible in this respect. The final boss in this game is neither a party, nor the market, nor the government, nor the BIS nor the WHO—it is the institutional cancer of greed and corruption that has metastasized throughout the global economic system and social structures. Civilization is beginning to cannibalize itself at the behest of a globalist structure, which in turn is looking for solutions to supposed overpopulation.

History shows that, in addition to money and power, eugenic ideas also play a role again and again when it comes to globalization driven by elites. In particular, it is probably the publicity-shy financiers of organizations such as the UN, the WHO, the IMF or the ECB who should be held responsible for the geopolitical misery of modernity.

After all, they benefit most from the policies and operations of supranational bodies whose agenda they shape. They are structures of organized crime.

Thus, the previously posed question “Cui bono?” can probably be answered with a simple proverb from criminology: Follow the money. In any case, corrupt, totalitarian cartels and power apparatuses cannot be destroyed with violence and hatred.

Because that's what they're prepared for. All you can do is stop taking them seriously.

"When it gets down to having to use violence, then you are playing the system's game. The establishment will irritate you – pull your beard, flick your face – to make you fight. Because once they've got you violent, then they know how to handle you. The only thing they don't know how to handle is non-violence and humor." (John Lennon)

64 Sports Kills

"Suddenly and unexpectedly." This expression is found more and more frequently in obituaries and spontaneous collapse has become the order of the day in high-performance sports. It's time to stop trivializing these circumstances.

"The great sport begins where it has long since ceased to be healthy." (Berthold Brecht)

After two years of the health crisis, the newspeak that established itself in the wake of the sometimes religious-seeming Covid cult is no longer really new. People have become accustomed to cognitive dissonance, and to newspaper articles whose headlines convey the opposite of what the advertised text subsequently reflects in terms of content. The cheekiest protagonists of the systematic reinterpretation of linguistic stabilizers of our value system soar at regular intervals to ever new heights of performance in Orwellian style.

Just when you think it couldn't become more contradictory, Germany's Minister of Health Karl Lauterbach took the floor again, setting a new record in terms of newspeak with the phrase "even compulsory vaccination leads to people being vaccinated voluntarily in the end." Coercion = freedom. Semantically, it's difficult to get much more 1984 out of it. With such schizophrenic statements, the sickly-looking and often confused-to-tipsy Federal Minister of Health insults the intelligence of every human being

who, in full possession of his or her mental faculties, is trying to make sense of the confused pharmaceutical advertisements of top politicians, the media and those pushing the vaccines.

Lauterbach's logic—if the thought processes of the pharmaceutical lobbyist are even still worthy of the term—wrests a good deal of mental contortions from the reflective and rational observer.

In the aftermath, the Federal Ministry of Health then sought to outdo its own director by claiming, in an effort to control the damage, that Lauterbach had only referred to an excerpt of the executing doctor in the explosive quote. Needless to say, the agency could not hold a candle to the "Minister of Panic" in matters of Orwellianism. The absurdities with which desperate attempts are made to squeeze coercion into the linguistic straightjacket of freedom, in order to replace the enlightened-humanistic value system in the long term are exemplified by an article from *wmn*, an outlet of the FUNKE media group. I will spare the reader an autopsy of the intellectually dead text, because it is the unreflected scribbling that disqualifies itself.

As smugly as this can still be commented on in relation to these and comparable verbal follies, the linguistic trivialization of precarious facts in a different, deadly serious context seems grotesque, outrageous and sad. Because while you don't have to take a neurotic-looking political extra like Karl Lauterbach seriously, Orwellian verbal acrobatics elsewhere obscure serious problems and human fates that can no longer be ignored in public. This is the case, for example, in top-level sports.

"Sudden and unexpected" is not only a phrase that can be found with increasing frequency in obituaries of supposedly healthy people who were actively participating in life not long ago but

died shortly after a Covid-19 vaccination, it is also being used more and more often in professional sports. Since the beginning of the vaccination campaign, it seems that the particularly well-trained professionals who are permanently monitored by sports doctors have been suffering more and more often from spontaneous "ailments."

Whether they do soccer, tennis, track and field, American football, weight training or boxing, top athletes are falling over as if struck by lightning with conspicuous consistency. Many of them die, and some of the images are shocking. The most common diagnosis is "sudden cardiac arrest," in addition to various other problems.

Just looking at FIFA's sudden-death list, in other words, a list of professional soccer players who died suddenly and unexpectedly during a match, makes it clear that something has been wrong since the mRNA mass injections began. For the year 2021, it reported 21 deaths on the field, which is a 500 percent increase according to an analysis published by World Signals, an Israeli news portal, as early as November 26, 2021. It is also significant that FIFA's sudden-death list, which began in 1889, documented little more than one death per year for the first 100 years but has reported a steady rise in numbers since about 1980. At first glance, this does not necessarily speak for the lifestyle and high-performance sports of the modern age.

While the mainstream media babble about coincidence, causality and correlation, and cling to the claim that vaccinations can by no means be the causal trigger of these problems, freelance journalists take the trouble to analyze the topic in a more open-ended way. Among them is the British journalist Mark Playne, who maintains a running list on his news portal Not On the Beeb to illustrate the extent of the disaster.

Report24 from Austria has also set up a similar collection, as has the blog *The Truth is Where*. Of course, it cannot be proven with certainty that all these athletes developed health problems or died only because of the vaccination—but you can't look away and move on either.

Without claiming to be exhaustive, and in recognition of possible redundancies, such an accumulation of problems must nevertheless be analyzed transparently and publicly debated. It is an elephant in the room that can no longer be overlooked.

"The most difficult gymnastics exercise is still to hold yourself in your arms." (Werner Finck)

The (peer-reviewed) *Primary Doctor Medical Journal* also published a study on January 16, 2022, suggesting that subjects treated with mRNA are less productive than people who have not received a Covid-19 vaccination. *Tkp.at*, a well-known science and policy blog, reported on the study's findings on January 25, 2022. Reading the paper entitled "Student athletes perform worse than controls following COVID vaccines" gives every reason to believe that the so-called vaccines are harmful to health in the long term.

Thousands of serious side effects and deaths have also been documented by Save Us Now, a new democratic civil rights movement from Great Britain, which on its website links to no less than 1,011 official studies that illustrate the horror of mass mRNA side effects. Together, this is a disturbing catalogue of avoidable human suffering.

In this context, it is noteworthy that the Iranian news agency Tasnim News Agency already reported on March 10, 2017 that a newly discovered gene was found responsible for the increase

in sudden cardiac arrest in young athletes. In 2017 and 2018, a conspicuous number of professional soccer players had died suddenly and unexpectedly on the field.

Even though the aforementioned article explains that the researchers attribute this development to a novel genetic defect, it remains unclear what the cause of the abnormality of the genome is.

People are similarly disoriented today. Based on the available data and their various forms of interpretation, there have been approximately 600 deaths on the field within one year across the various sports, which has been unprecedented in history. Nevertheless, there are no official surveys, analyses or discussions on the subject, even though our fellow human beings are literally falling over like flies. The supposed prophylaxis apparently carries greater risks for friends of physical exercise than the virus, whose IFR (Infection Fatality Rate) ranks in the per thousand range, even according to the latest studies.

In this context, it is also astonishing that there is virtually no criticism of the official narrative from the big sports leagues, especially from professional soccer. Top leagues should be outraged when players, for whom they pay millions in transfer fees and salaries, are not fit for action, endangered or even doomed to die.

Sports officials have long since realized that there is a correlation between vaccination campaigns and the increase in health problems in their squads. Nevertheless, the voices of those who dare to resist the pressure of the professional sports system remain silent cries, even though data and facts speak for them.

As the figures from the UK show, it is the people treated with mRNA who are now increasingly hospitalized and are exposed

to a greater health risk overall. While already evident after the first round of injections, and very clear after the second round, it became clear beyond a shadow of a doubt after the booster shots, according to the figures from the United Kingdom, which are probably among the most accurate in the world.

The UK Health Security Agency's Covid-19 Vaccine Surveillance Report of January 20, 2022 paints a clear picture in this regard—if you take the trouble to examine the details. And page 44 of the Scottish counterpart also speaks for itself.

The vaccinated end up in the clinic. A detailed analysis of the respective figures is provided by the journalist Ryan Cristian from the United States, who regularly subjects the status reports from the UK in his program to close scrutiny.

Another finding of the past few weeks is that mRNA products are obviously subject to strong qualitative fluctuations, in the sense that many batches differ in content. Dr. Michael Yeadon, former vice president of research at Pfizer, investigated the irregularities using the batch numbers and made the data available on the www.howbadismybatch.com website. The page is not visually appealing, as it was created at short notice, but the content is quite something.

A closer look at the numbers seems to confirm Dr. Yeadon's conclusion that certain batches are particularly fatal, as these particular batch numbers are responsible for almost all serious side effects and deaths, while the remaining 90 percent of the batches have hardly any complications.

Yeadon's analysis also shows that after a Pfizer batch categorized as having "serious adverse effects," understood as leading to

several hundred deaths, similarly toxic batches from Moderna and the other manufacturers are administered with a time delay and at regular intervals. An overlap or simultaneous application of the batches in question is therefore deliberately avoided.

One could therefore assume that the mRNA producers are colluding on these time periods or have mapped them in the supply chain process to avoid too many side effects occurring at the same time—and to ensure that each company involved can bring the same number of "serious adverse effects" batches into the test series. This is because the arrangement of the data certainly reveals something like an experimental set-up. If one assumes intent based on the available data, one will have to assume that the pharmaceutical companies are conducting illegal field trials on humans and varying either dosage, ingredients or toxicity in order to achieve research goals that remain disguised.

Overall, although, in view of the information cited, it seems obvious that vaccination is not a game changer, that we are now dealing with a pandemic of the vaccinated, and that the number of side effects is increasing exorbitantly, the topic continues to be trivialized or hushed up, especially in high-performance sports.

The phrasings used in the media channels that conform to the system exceed the wildest expectations of audacity. Succinct reasons such as "lack of exercise" are cited, arguing that the athletes trained less or lived less healthily during the lockdowns. Others go so far as to scour through the medical histories of the athletes, in order to find something, anything, that could be associated with the acute myocarditis. Commentators who dare to say a critical word about vaccination during live broadcasts have their microphones turned off in the middle of a sentence.

The media deploys every imaginable linguistic device and strains logic to an absurd extreme in order to circumvent the topic semantically. A striking number of articles written on the topic are also parked behind a paywall. Apparently, the corporate media do not want to attract readers.

However, some gems of newspeak journalism are freely accessible. Reuters, for example, concedes in an article that they simply don't know anything, and points out that too many health checks on athletes are a hindrance to access to high-performance sports. In other words, the media distracts and downplays the topic. The German Bayrischer Rundfunk, for its part, is not above equating "myocarditis" with "mild symptom," although the inflammation of the human heart can under no circumstance be considered "mild."

The German media outlet Correctiv also tried to put the topic to rest with a fact check published on January 5, 2022. The outlet—a gatekeeper portal of public perception that confirms practically everything the government says and writes—doubts the validity of the Wikipedia FIFA list (linked in the article) but cites only two sources, each state-subsidized institutions, to prove its own position.

Of course, Correctiv also ignores the numerous research results and texts of freelance journalists who have dealt with the topic in detail, as well as all other inconsistencies regarding the mRNA products. The mainstream tenor's conclusion: There is no problem. At least not one that would be due to the vaccinations.

Correctiv itself is responsible for one of the absolute highlights of "Corona newspeak" journalism. In an article from December 13, 2019, the outlet declares in bold letters of the headline: "No, cells

from human fetuses and monkeys or glyphosate are not ingredients of vaccinations," only to, a mere two lines later, state that "It is true that traces of the three substances can occur in it—in very small quantities, which are not harmful." As you can see, the Correctiv team relied on cognitive dissonance very early on in the crisis—or suffered from it itself.

"Journalists: the midwives and gravediggers of time." (Karl Ferdinand Gutzkow)

The fact-checking industry and social media propaganda are likely to be the main reasons why the official narratives have such wide-reaching tentacles. A wide range of vax-pushing influencer accounts and propaganda trumpets, managed by professional agencies, are contaminating the internet with a sedating one-size-fits-all opinion.

The most recent example is Doc Caro, a German doctor-turned-pseudo-hip influencer. Practicing only part-time due to her new media career, she has been blessed with the opportunity to live out her urge for self-expression on prime-time television ever since the beginning of the pandemic. The same applies to what appears to be the only German intensive care nurse, Ralf Berning. In any event, no other intensive care nurse has had a television presence thus far.

By pure coincidence, the two pandemic extras are supervised by one and the same media agency in Cologne. Bought artificial figures who are allowed to trumpet propaganda phrases of the pharmacological-financial complex into people's private living rooms at prime time and for a lot of money.

Their various social media accounts were all opened in late 2019, as journalist Michael Ziesmann revealed, and are of course not

maintained by the protagonists personally, as claimed, but by authors from said agency in Cologne. Coincidence, foresight, insider knowledge?

Time will tell. In any case, such people tend to react thin-skinned to inquiries about their monetary benefits or the background of media engagements, as shown by a reply letter from Ralf Berning to Michael Ziesmann. The fact that "fact checking" de facto stands for the censorship of free speech delegated by governments to private institutions is particularly evident when looking at the Poynter Institute, a journalism school, which was founded in Florida (USA) in 1975.

But as aptly described in a text from January 12, 2021 published by a German initiative against corruption and lobbyism, the supposed educational institution of the fourth estate is now primarily dedicated to checking and securing state-legitimized corridors of opinion. To this end, the Poynter Institute operates the site Politifact, which itself discloses that it accepts donations from Facebook, TikTok, Google and other representatives of the platform oligarchy in order to take action against unwelcome information on the internet.

"*The icon of journalism, the Poynter Institute, which also runs the International Fact-Checking Network (IFCN), also funded Science Feedback to build and operate its database of fact-checks and websites that (supposedly) spread the most misinformation. As part of the circular economy financing process, the IFCN's revenues come from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Google, Facebook and government agencies such as the US Department of State*." (our translation; Initiative gegen Korruption und Lobbyismus)

The Poynter Institute's 2018 fiscal financial statements show in detail the extensive financial resources available for the fight

against pluralism of opinion and who is committed to it. It is precisely these non-transparent, democratically illegitimate institutions and artificial figures that make the normal population believe in an illusory reality that no longer bears any relation to the reality of life. Their tactics—manipulation, psychosis, propaganda and nudging—may explain why the ongoing series of deaths in high-performance sports does not trigger more public indignation.

It is only such a massive influence of public perception that could explain how even celebrated sports idols can be written off as persona non grata by the mainstream media within hours, *and* how such portrayals are readily and seamlessly adopted by the audience. From superstar to pariah via one tweet, if it comes from the right account. That is the post-truth era we are in, the epoch of alternative truths. This is segregation and fascism—identifiable in newspeak in its final stages.

Collapse, breakdown, cardiac arrest—whatever the official medical term may be—there are undeniable irregularities regarding the global rollout of mRNA products that call for a public discussion. The public's exposure to the ominous mishaps and deaths in high-performance sports alone should have by now convinced them of the need for such a discussion, even if the man on the street may not be drawn to examine all the raw data and details pertaining to this matter.

Vaccines are still novel pharmacological substances with emergency use authorization, for which long-term studies do not yet exist. For this reason alone, a mandatory vaccination should be out of the question. As late as November 2019, Biontech CEO Ugur Sahin, now slated to be immortalized on EU banknotes (*Tagesspiegel*), was not expecting mRNA products to be approved within less than four to five years.

This is evidenced by a TV report by SWR (Südwest-Rundfunk), which repeatedly makes the rounds on portals such as Twitter.

It is therefore indisputable that we are dealing here with an experiment on humans, the long-term effects of which are incalculable. However, so far, even the short-term consequences of the mRNA rollout have been devastating.

Official databases such as VAERS or EudraVigilance record hundreds of thousands of serious side effects and deaths related to the Covid-19 vaccinations. And the WHO has already attested to more than 2.5 million registered cases of severe side effects in relation to the novel gene therapies—knowing full well that only about ten percent of cases are officially reported at all. By comparison: the recorded data of 23 other tested vaccines, taken together and aggregated over a period of more than 50 years (since data collection began in 1968), has amounted to only 1.77 million cases of serious side effects. This ratio should make every rational person ponder—and if the Nuremberg Code still has any relevance, it should convince them that the mRNA rollout must be stopped immediately.

This is because the mRNA products do not have the promised effect and seem to create more problems than they solve, no matter how much politicians obstinately claim the opposite, overriding facts, and no matter how hard the schizophrenic newspeak of Germany's publicly funded media network tries to make the fee payers believe otherwise.

"You rejoice in the power of the press—but don't you ever dread its tyranny?" (Marie von Ebner-Eschenbach)

January 29, 2022

Trotsky, the Commonwealth and Wall Street

The geopolitical monopoly is in full swing. NATO, China and Russia are dominating the global game of hegemonic domination. A hot war on Europe's external borders seems conceivable. The constant saber-rattling of the three power blocs creates a threatening backdrop à la Orwell. The question is: Cui bono?

"Revolution: The fire on which some burn and others cook their soup." (John Carrick)

As my text "Mao, Yale and the Hegemony" of January 21, 2022 tried to show, China is not the geopolitical class enemy of Western hegemony, even if the Middle Kingdom is often characterized as such in the media. On the contrary, the People's Republic serves as an experimental laboratory for the totalitarian social model of the future, and as a military-industrial counterpart to the other power blocs of the global game of monopoly.

In this context, today's world order curiously resembles the international power structures described by George Orwell in *1984*. In his dystopia, there is a permanent war between Oceania, Eurasia and East Asia. A conflict that cements the prevailing world order, freezes it, frames it as being without alternative. Because the three blocks are absolutely equal militarily, a never-ending

conflict determines and legitimizes the inhumane actions of the totalitarian system, which thanks to this strategy can hold on to power indefinitely—even if the devastating battles are fictional in nature and only take place as a threatening narrative in the news. The setup creates a self-perpetuating cycle of fear. And it is an astonishing reminder of the acute focus on crises into which modern, digitalized society has become bogged down.

Therefore, it certainly does not take much imagination to identify a certain congruence regarding the current power-political constellations on the planet. My analysis of China's geostrategic role has already been explained in the text referenced at the beginning. It remained unclear how Russia's position on the international game board should be classified. This is especially true because NATO currently seems to be aiming for a hot war with Putin.

At present, it is difficult to assess whether the Western military alliance, which is illegally expanding eastwards, is really seeking an armed confrontation with the former Soviet Union or whether, as with George Orwell, it is simply a matter of maintaining a geostrategic status quo by means of appropriate narratives. The short-term developments are too opaque and contradictory for a serious assessment to be made.

However, what can be historically traced and proven based on reliable sources is that Russia did not take its current position on the geostrategic Monopoly board primarily on the basis of organic political or historical developments but was rather assigned that position by massive intervention of the Anglo-Saxon financial oligarchy of the early twentieth century.

In retrospect, it is precisely these wealthy circles that can be identified as the big winners of the two world wars. Organized

crime, fraud and corruption are everywhere you look. If one takes to heart an old motto of criminology—follow the money—it quickly becomes clear why, after the dawn of the twentieth century, certain financial-diplomatic circles of the "Empire" were quite happy to see Europe sink into war, Germany defeated and Russia shaken by revolution.

Thus, at the beginning of the twentieth century, Britain and its Anglo-Saxon hegemony the Commonwealth, which still includes 54 countries, including Australia, South Africa, New Zealand and Canada—were considered the dominant force on the planet. This arrogant self-conception of global supremacy is made clear by a quote from Queen Elizabeth II from 1959:

> **"The (founding of) the Confederation of Canada on July 1, 1867, was the birth of the first independent country within the British Empire."**

But at the turn of the century, the empire on which the sun never sets had some problems maintaining its supremacy on the global Monopoly board and especially in Europe. The prosperous German Empire was just as much a thorn in the side of the British as was the difficult to assess Russia.

Influential circles in London, for example, advocated early on to transform the Anglo-Saxon hegemony into an Anglo-American hegemony and to expand Britain's influence in Russia.

The intention was to reorganize the power blocs. Great Britain was to continue to dominate the world financially—as is assured to this day by the "City of London," which is endowed with special rights and privileges—but from then on, the military dirty work was to be left to the Americans.

Because even though the United States was already a global player at that time, it did not yet play the role of the supposed world policeman that the country still plays today after the two world wars. This latter status was only established when the United States entered the war.

The current balance of power shows us that the anti-democratic influence of powerful puppet masters such as Cecil Rhodes, Alfred Milner, Arthur James Balfour or Walter Rothschild, 2nd Baron Rothschild on political processes was ultimately successful. After all, historical documents, such as the various wills that Cecil Rhodes wrote during his short life, already imply shortly after the turn of the century that today's geopolitical constellations are no coincidence.

The texts in question are freely accessible on the internet, and an annotated edition of the insightful writings can even be purchased from the monopolist Amazon. And these texts are, despite their inconsequential title, of paramount importance. Cecil Rhodes was considered by many to be the most powerful and richest person of his time. And his hegemonic visions have been proven to have an impact far beyond his death. He was, albeit with other means, a Laurence Douglas Fink of his time.

"Pure philanthropy is very good in its own way, but philanthropy plus five percent is a lot better." (Cecil Rhodes)

This also demonstrates that the fact Rhodes asked in his texts, well before 1902, that his unimaginable fortune be used for the purpose of building a secret society that would complete his vision of the unification of the Anglo-American world is not a simple conspiracy theory, as Wikipedia portrays it. These are clear instructions from a man who had the will, power and means to turn his visions into reality.

Indeed, the renowned US historian Caroll Quigley had already reported on this in his one-thousand-page classic *Tragedy and Hope*, published in 1966. And to this day, the Rhodes Trust grants a Rhodes Scholarship every year to some 200 students, which gives the selected young statists access to the elite University of Oxford.

That said, the once revered patron has since fallen into disrepute somewhat. More than 100 years after Rhodes' death, a larger number of people became aware whose brainchild the founder of the Round Table was, and that the alleged philanthropist was not only an unscrupulous imperialist but also an avowed racist and supporter of eugenics. In March 2015, for example, the Rhodes Must Fall movement was formed at the University of Cape Town and ensured, among other things, that a huge monument to the namesake was removed from the campus of the South African educational institution.

> **"I contend that we are the finest race in the world and that the more of the world we inhabit, the better it is for the human race. Just fancy those parts that are at present inhabited by the most despicable specimens of human beings what an alteration there would be if they were brought under Anglo-Saxon influence, look again at the extra employment a new country added to our dominions gives." (Cecil Rhodes)**

From the 1900s to the 1920s, Rhodes' influential accomplices positioned themselves at the control centers of the Commonwealth's power.

Alfred Milner, Cecil Rhodes' closest confidant, was largely responsible for Britain's domestic and foreign policy from the mid-1890s to the early 1920s and was considered the most important

member of the war cabinet of the then-prime minister David Lloyd George—who himself expressed his approval of the abdication of the last Russian tsar in several letters.

In addition, David Lloyd George was an ardent supporter of Adolf Hitler, whom he referred to as the "George Washington of Germany." Following the end of the First World War, he thus helped the dark force to rise to power that provoked a Second World War that, in turn, created the conditions for the structures of today's world order.

Alfred Milner is also considered the official founder of the Round Table movement, an opaque association of influential people committed to the international dominance of Anglo-American hegemony. In fact, however, it was Rhodes who created the imperialist club.

Since 1910, the movement has published the quarterly *Round Table Journal*, whose articles were published entirely without an author until 1966. A quick glance at the list of former editors-in-chief shows how closely the supposedly British philanthropy journal is connected to the United States empire.

Emblematic of the work of the Round Table movement and its influential members is the Balfour Declaration, which is largely responsible for the current structure of the Middle East and the end of the Ottoman Empire.

For it was not the then-British foreign secretary Arthur James Balfour himself who wrote the momentous document but the financial magnate Walter Rothschild. In close consultation with Lord Alfred Milner, he defined what the Arab world should look like in the future.

And it was only when Rothschild and Milner agreed on the content and wording that the British government received the document to subsequently publish as the Balfour Declaration. This presumptuously elitist process of global reorganization is laid out and presented on a website created especially on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the Balfour Declaration. On the site, the original correspondence, the changes in the wording and the close coordination between Alfred Milner and Walter Rothschild are visible to everyone. However, none of this has much to do with the story being told to the general public about the Balfour Declaration.

Further background information and all sorts of meticulously researched details on the workings of the international financial oligarchy can be found in the book *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution*, published in 1974, which deals specifically with the influence of Western capital in Russia.

The extensive work was written by Professor Anthony Cyril Sutton, a renowned researcher, economist and author from England, who gained access to official documents of the Canadian government for his work and was thus able to analyze the topic in detail. Asked about reasons or motives for elitist and apparently undemocratic, illegal and consequential agreements of this kind, Anthony Cyril Sutton replied in a TV interview:

> **"The reasons? You won't find that in the textbooks. I suspect that a centrally planned, controlled world society is to be created in which you and I will not find the freedom to believe, think, and do what we believe."**

The fact that colonialist, Anglo-Saxon or Anglo-American high finance exerted its massive geopolitical influence not only in

Asia, China, Africa and the Arab world to make the controlled world society mentioned by Sutton a reality, but also in Russia, is exemplified by two leading and often glorified figures of Russian history: Vladimir Ilyich Lenin and Leon Trotsky.

> **"Why should we not form a secret society with but one object, the furtherance of the British Empire and the bringing of the whole world under British rule, for the recovery of the United States, for making the Anglo-Saxon race but one empire? What a dream, but yet it is probable; it is possible." (Cecil Rhodes)**

Trotsky clearly enjoyed being picked up by the comfortable limousine. And although he pretended to stand up for the disadvantaged working class, he didn't necessarily like it when the chauffeur working for him came into the house for a short time.

"*When they went to a tearoom, the boys would ask their mother, confused, 'Why doesn't the chauffeur come in?'*" (*Leon Trotsky: My Life*, New York Publishing: Scribner, 1930, p. 277)

He didn't seem to have any money problems. He lived with his wife and two children far beyond his means and even had a refrigerator of his own.

In February 1917, even in progressive New York, this was still a status symbol reserved for the upper class. It seems implausible that he was able to finance this lifestyle with his ostensible main occupation as a columnist for the newspapers *Novy Mir* and *The Forward*. Indeed, a look behind the façade of the later founder of the Red Army gives every reason to believe that he did not act entirely independently. As is so often the case in recent history, shortly before a regime change, a war or a disruptive

crisis, international high finance came on the scene to put its own spin on further developments.

Trotsky himself wrote several times about his rich friend "Dr. M." and his wife. The mysterious benefactor seemed to provide him with the limousine service and also to bear the other expenses for the author of the *Zimmerwald Manifesto* in the Big Apple.

"*The doctor's wife took my wife and the boys out for a ride and was very kind to them. But she was only a mortal, while the chauffeur was a wizard, a titan, a superman. With a wave of his hand, he made the machine obey his slightest command.*" (*Leon Trotsky: My Life*, New York Publishing: Scribner, 1930, p. 277)

Although there is little hard evidence to support the claim, various sources suggest that the unknown financier may have been Jacob Schiff, the influential head of Kuhn, Loeb & Co.—one of the most powerful Wall Street banks of the time, which was seeking lucrative business opportunities when the Bolshevik revolutionaries came to power in Russia.

As the official Wikipedia entry of Lev Davidovich Bronstein, Trotsky's real name, reports, the left-wing rebel had been deported from France to Spain, and then arrested there and deported to the United States.

That sounds worse than it ended up being. As the *N.Y. Volkszeitung* reported in a short article on January 14, 1917, the future People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs, for War, Food, Transport and Publishing of the Soviet Union arrived in the American metropolis in good spirits and safe and sound on board the Spanish steamship "Montserrat."

In February 1917, Tsar Nicholas II, the last autocrat of the Russian Empire, abdicated. His end sealed the fate of the monarchy in the country. In the spring of 1917, the dual leadership of the Duma (parliament) and the Soviet (people's and soldiers' councils) fought bitterly for internal supremacy.

Russia was a powder keg. After appointing a provisional government, the following fall, the Duma would probably have seized the opportunity to convene a constituent assembly to determine the future course of the vast country. But the next revolution was to pre-empt parliament, which had been infiltrated by British circles. However, the October Revolution was not prepared in Russia but in the United States and Switzerland. It was only through the logistical and financial support of the supposed class enemies that Lenin and Trotsky were able to seize power by force in October 1917 and thus shape Russia's course to the present day.

Although Trotsky was known only among Marxist intellectuals in Europe until his arrival in the United States, he was courted by various parties in the days following his arrival in New York. Reporters from at least six newspapers stood at Pier 8 in Manhattan at 3 a.m. to report on his arrival on the Spanish ship.

He was repeatedly interviewed by the Jewish newspaper *The Forward,* which portrayed him as a "Russian revolutionary par excellence." *The Forward,* with 200,000 copies printed per day, was able to compete with the *New York Times* in terms of circulation.

Trotsky gave dozens of lectures in the US metropolis and promoted his political ideas to the public. The *Times of Israel* discussed the impact of Trotsky's trip to the United States on the Bolshevik Revolution in a September 19, 2016 article.

The US president at the time, Woodrow Wilson, had issued Trotsky with a passport so that he could travel to Russia via Canada. When Trotsky was arrested in Canada as a Russian revolutionary on his way to Russia, he had $10,000 worth of gold with him—unusual for a penniless scribbler.

When the ship on which he was travelling arrived in Halifax, he was received by both the British and the Canadians—an equally unusual situation. And when the Canadians were not sure whether to let Trotsky have his way, the British Foreign Office intervened and gave the green light for the onward journey. The revolutionary was allowed to get back on board and make his way to his old home, where he obviously had a historic mission to fulfill.

One could argue that his stay in New York made Trotsky, who until then had only been known to insiders, a leading political figure on the international stage—and that he would never have achieved his goal without the support of the United States government and influential circles of Anglo-Saxon or Anglo-American high finance.

Justice 4 Poland, the blog of a Polish civil rights site, appears to offer a good summary of the above-mentioned context, albeit I have not been able to vet the website as such.

Trotsky's comrade, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, who was in exile in Switzerland at the time, also owed it to foreign forces and means that he was able to return to Russia at all and finance the revolutionary efforts of October 1917. In addition to American high finance, the Germans also saw subjective advantages in the potential seizure of power by the Bolsheviks.

"*It was only when the Bolsheviks received steady funds from us through various channels and under different labels that they were*

able to build up their main organ, the newspaper Pravda, to carry out vigorous propaganda and to expand the originally weak base of their party."

(Von Kühlmann, Minister of Foreign Affairs, writing to the German Emperor, December 3, 1917)

In addition to the British and Americans, the German Empire and neutral Switzerland were also involved in the success of the October Revolution in Russia. Anthony C. Sutton writes about this in his aforementioned book on the Bolshevik Revolution:

"*In April 1917 Lenin and a party of 32 Russian revolutionaries, mostly Bolsheviks, journeyed by train from Switzerland across Germany through Sweden to Petrograd, Russia. They were on their way to join Leon Trotsky to "complete the revolution." Their trans-Germany transit was approved, facilitated, and financed by the German General Staff. Lenin's transit to Russia was part of a plan approved by the German Supreme Command, apparently not immediately known to the kaiser, to aid in the disintegration of the Russian army and so eliminate Russia from World War I. The possibility that the Bolsheviks might be turned against Germany and Europe did not occur to the German General Staff. Major General Hoffman has written, "We neither knew nor foresaw the danger to humanity from the consequences of this journey of the Bolsheviks to Russia. At the highest-ranking German political officer who approved Lenin's journey to Russia was Chancellor Theobald von Bethmann-Hollweg, a descendant of the Frankfurt banking family Bethmann, which achieved great prosperity in the nineteenth century. Bethmann-Hollweg was appointed chancellor in 1909 and in November 1913 became the subject of the first vote of censure ever passed by the German Reichstag on a chancellor.*"

Another key figure who contributed decisively to the success of the revolutionary efforts in Russia was the controversial Olof Aschberg—at the time nicknamed "Banker of the Bolsheviks" in the German press. Aschberg was the owner of Nya Bank, which was founded in Stockholm in 1912. From August 1922, Aschberg headed Russia's Roscombank, a banking and development vehicle that still operates today under the name VEB and that has over $50 billion worth of assets and has financed over 300 individual projects. In 1922, it was the first international bank in Russia. The fact that Aschberg was not only a collaborative Swede with a soft spot for the Bolsheviks is once again proven by the research of Anthony C. Sutton:

"*Nya Banken changed its name to Svensk Ekonomiebolaget. The bank remained under the control of Aschberg, and was mainly owned by him. The bank's London agent was the British Bank of North Commerce, whose chairman was Earl Grey, former associate of Cecil Rhodes.*
Others in Aschberg's interesting circle of business associates included Leonid Krassin, who was until the Bolshevik Revolution (when he changed color to emerge as a leading Bolshevik) Russian manager of Siemens-Schukert in Petrograd; Carl Furstenberg, minister of finance in the first Bolshevik government; and Max May, vice president in charge of foreign operations for Guaranty Trust of New York. Olof Aschberg thought so highly of Max May that a photograph of May is included in Aschberg's book."

The (Morgan) Guaranty Trust Company of New York also covertly funded German efforts in World War I and helped implement German intelligence operations on American soil, even though it was playing a non-neutral role and working against the United States. The funds from New York flowed to the German government via Deutsche Bank, which was founded in 1869. Hugo

Schmidt of Deutsche Bank played an important role in this, as documented in a newspaper article in the New York Tribune dated May 9, 1918.

These historical connections and the influence of individual characters such as Cecil Rhodes, of whom *Historic UK* still paints a heroic portrait as a pioneer for the Commonwealth, illustrate once again how intensively and anti-democratically international financial conglomerates have been working together behind the scenes for over a century to expand their economic spheres of influence and implement the world order that Cecil Rhodes once envisioned.

Today, Rhodes' centralist vision of the globalized and totalitarian-controlled world is reflected in the flowery "2030 Agenda," with which the UN is virtually completely advancing to absolute global governance—to world government.

Olof Aschberg, on behalf of his influential mentors, ensured that Russia opened the doors to the Western financial oligarchy. This was the only way that geostrategically active organizations such as JPMorgan Chase, Kuhn, Loeb & Co. or the Rockefeller dynasty could begin to assert their elitist interests in Russia shortly after the October Revolution. Political ideas have always been of secondary importance to international big business, who finance and instrumentalize only what serves their own goals.

It doesn't matter whether it's National Socialism, communism, a dictatorship or democracy. The only thing that counts is the monetary outcome.

It is in the nature of things that a superficial analysis based on selected historical events—which, unfortunately, this book is

limited to—cannot do full justice to the complex development of our world over the past 100 years. Nevertheless, the referenced sources and documents provide a brief insight into consequential, often omitted facts and give every reason to believe that various interest groups have influenced the geopolitical developments of the past century in their favor.

The evidence cited implies that today's state of affairs resembles Orwell's dystopia of three consciously instrumentalized global centers of power. Furthermore, there is reason to believe that these three blocks did not arise by pure coincidence or organic growth processes but were at least partially financed and installed by one and the same interest group.

A crude circle of cross-generational criminal gangs, anchored in international corporate oligarchy and high finance, has been trying for a century to install extra-parliamentary, supranational organizations to seize more and more power away from democratic processes.

It follows that the socio-economic and geopolitical developments in the wake of the two world wars, the Cold War or the fight against terrorism must be seen in context. The background processes of these historical milestones are intertwined. Viewed in isolation, interpretations of the individual events fall short in terms of their historical effects.

Therefore, it is worthwhile to note the detailed documentary film *The WWI Conspiracy* by investigative journalist James Corbett as a further source of information on the background of the First World War and the resulting geopolitical developments.

"If you don't want civil war, you have to become imperialists."
(Cecil Rhodes)

In the light of these historical events, the current crisis between Russia and the Western military alliance NATO also presents itself differently than the official narrative suggests. Based on the connections explained above, it is clear that the current geopolitical situation did not arise by chance but that the three power blocs were deliberately created, positioned and played off against each other in the past.

It remains unclear, however, whether the saber-rattling in the wake of the Ukraine crisis is a real provocation of an armed conflict—or whether the supranational circles simply want to exacerbate the threat scenario, seeing that the Covid crisis is temporarily losing momentum.

The most important thing for the ruling system is that the population is afraid—of what is beside the point. As long as the average citizen sees himself threatened by crises that he personally cannot contend with, he accepts the leadership of representative bodies that pretend to act in his interest—even though the opposite is true.

The President of Ukraine, Volodymyr Zelensky, is currently publicly stating that in his eyes there is no acute threat from Russia, and Ukraine is not on the verge of an invasion by Putin's troops. And Putin himself comments on the situation objectively and signals a willingness to talk. NATO, however, categorically rejects any cooperation regarding Ukraine and leaves an ultimatum set by Russia for a diplomatic response pass unanswered. At the same time, the European Union is doing everything in its power to co-opt Ukraine. Because even though

the country is not an official member of the EU, unsolicited arms deliveries are authorized by member states and millions of dollars are made available to Zelensky's government for defense purposes.

German Defense Minister Lambrecht announced that she wants to ship 5,000 steel helmets, an embarrassment according to the *FOCUS*. It is logical that this action on Russia's doorstep does not trigger a dance of joy in the former Soviet Union. Moreover, NATO's procedure, which violates international law, shows that it is not Russia that is taking on the role of aggressor in this conflict.

It remains to be seen how this confrontation will develop. It is to be hoped that NATO's military provocations are mere demonstrations of power and the maintenance of the supposed geopolitical threat. After all, a hot war on Europe's external borders could quickly develop into world war number three. And no normal person wants to experience that.

> **"I don't know with what weapons World War III will be fought, but World War IV will be fought with sticks and stones." (Attributed to: Albert Einstein)**

Unfortunately, however, the last century has also proven that military conflicts, however devastating they may be for humanity, are desirable for certain circles and suit supranational plans of elitist globalists and imperialists like Cecil Rhodes. It is not for nothing that the current geostrategic status quo is based on the results of two world wars, nuclear weapons and the so-called cold war. Now, after the war on terrorism, which seems to have vanished into thin air with the onset of Covid, the world is in a permanent battle against health risks.

And that battle won't end, just as little as the fight against climate change and the other horror scenarios that are used to keep people compliant. Only constant crisis can legitimize the ruling system. Because everyone is aware that it is corrupt.

Therefore, today it is more important than ever that the human family understands itself as a unit that is beyond ideology, religion or skin color, and that in this spirit is committed to a new world order—a humane world order, free from the greedy parasites of a criminal, intergenerational financial oligarchy that ignores national laws as studiously as it ignores universal human rights. We are the 99 percent—and we should decide for ourselves how we want to live our lives.

February 6, 2022

94

The Trojan Herd

Non-governmental organizations (NGOs)—groups that take up the cause of noble goals and supposedly serve charitable purposes. But that's only half the story. Under the guise of philanthropy, quite a few are committed to hegemonic visions of global governance.

"Whenever you're on the side of the majority, it's time to stop and think." (Mark Twain)

Non-governmental organizations (NGOs)—many people associate this term with something positive, such as charitable causes, humanitarian missions and environmental protection. The United Nations (UN), the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), PETA or Greenpeace: they all supposedly stand for the fight for a better world and vie for attention with budgets in the millions. In contrast to the "trusts" that operate more in the background—the non-transparent clearinghouse of the corporate oligarchy—the NGOs are at the center of socio-economic and media events. They are an integral part of modern civil society and have a significant influence on its long-term development.

This calls on us to take a closer look behind the scenes of the supposedly non-profit structures. A considerable part of the population, even in lean years, diligently donates small amounts of their hard-earned net salaries and volunteers their time at organizations whose actual structures they are rarely aware of.

Quite a few of the NGOs, which are apparently committed to the common good, serve, in addition to their core tasks, imperialist purposes of corporatist oligarchy.

From an economic point of view, they hardly differ from a large corporation with a high turnover. And in the pursuit of their hidden agenda, morals, values, the organization's "mission statement," or the usual public relations phrases such as inclusion, sustainability and democracy are usually thrown by the wayside. What counts are the financiers' interests.

It is significant that the former head of Greenpeace, Jennifer Morgan, is to move to the German Foreign Ministry at the behest of Annalena Baerbock, as reported by *WELT*, among others, on February 8, 2022. Morgan is an American citizen and has led Greenpeace since 2016. She has been active in NGOs for decades. However, it would be illusory to think that the people moving in these circles wear faded jeans and philosophize, financially independently, about a better world. Philanthropy is a business like any other.

Greenpeace, for example, has more than 1,000 permanent employees and generated revenues of over 50 million euros a year in 2012, according to an infographic by Statista. The total income of the same year amounted to a whopping 270 million euros. It is well known that donations are often misused. Particularly precarious, however, were Greenpeace's financial speculations where, according to *SPIEGEL*, the environmental protection organization gambled away about 3.8 million euros in donations in currency transactions. However, the magazine did not explain why Greenpeace even conducts such financial transactions in the first place, instead of taking care of the core tasks of the organization with the lavish donations it receives.

In a short but exquisite interview from 2010, journalist David Harnasch aptly describes how the NGO business model works when he talks about PETA, the largest German animal welfare organization, which is best known for the provocative appearances of scantily clad activists.

"*While many NGOs have very specific goals, PETA is practically an NGO 2.0: political campaigns are used to raise money, which in turn is used to organize political campaigns. Therefore, unfortunately, there is no money left over for animal shelters or animal placement. Instead of providing concrete help to an individual living being in need, the organization pursues a great—and essentially misanthropic—goal: rights for animals. Again, my criticism is directed at the media and the celebrities who make themselves available en masse for this NGO: PETA is not an animal welfare organization but an animal rights organization.*
How crude the ideas cultivated there really are can be googled in five minutes. You can't expect this intellectual achievement from superficial actors, but you have to demand it from journalists."

How unscrupulous PETA is with donations is shown by a text by GERATI, an organization of opponents of radical animal protection, whose position one does not have to share, but whose analysis of PETA's financial conduct from 2018 is correct and, above all, shocking.

While PETA states on its own homepage that up to 88 percent of the donations are forwarded directly to animal welfare, the 2016 annual financial statements, which have since been deleted, show that practically nothing was spent on animal welfare in the year in question.

PETA needs the funds to finance fixed personnel costs and marketing campaigns to help the high-profile brand gain more reach. So that it can generate even higher donations

in the following year. It is a meaningless cycle—and deliberate fraud of the donor, the paying association member or volunteer citizen.

Even the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), parading a cuddly panda as its mascot, is by no means free of scandals. The organization, founded in Switzerland in 1961, generated an operating income of a remarkable 654 million euros in 2013. According to investigative research by BuzzFeed reporters Tom Warren and Katie Baker, who have dealt intensively with the topic for over a year, the WWF has financed paramilitary groups in Asia and Africa that tortured, raped and murdered poachers and ordinary villagers. Their off-road vehicles, equipment and weapons were all paid for by donations. And when the deadly escapades of the WWF rangers led to legal problems on the ground, the lobbyists under the sign of the panda penetrated relevant agencies until the accusations were finally dropped.

In addition to serious human rights violations, lax handling of donations and the implementation of inconsistent programs, the WWF is accused of working closely with corporations such as Coca-Cola, Hewlett-Packard or Johnson & Johnson, which like to borrow the world-famous and thus valuable and influential panda logo to give their own brand a green flair.

An extensive article by InfluenceWatch provides further information on the World Wildlife Fund and its reprehensible machinations.

It is also interesting to note that co-founder Julian Huxley, brother of the well-known writer Aldous Huxley (*Brave New World*), was also the first director-general of UNESCO and thus played a key role in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This is worth

mentioning because Julian Huxley is considered an avowed supporter of eugenics.

In his inaugural speech to UNESCO in 1946, he spoke quite liberally of the need to make eugenic ideas socially acceptable again in the future. Even if, after the Second World War, care was taken to give such initiatives meaningless, euphemistic titles.

But that's just the tip of the iceberg. The sheer number of non-governmental organizations is overwhelming. While the United Nations lists "only" 397 accredited NGOs on its website, WANGO, a globally operating umbrella organization, lists thousands and thousands of these organizations. The database contains an astonishing 23,131 entries for North America alone and more than 10,000 for Europe. Indeed, are we dealing with an armada of truly well-meaning people or rather a herd of Trojan horses?

> **"They want to do great things; but a short time in office is enough to show the political idealist that he can get nothing done, that his reforms must be diminished in value and dragged into the dust, so that, even if they become law, they will not only no longer be useful but also be an inevitable evil." (Margaret Sanger)**

The fact is that the most influential NGOs of our time were created and financed by people who were demonstrably members of an aristocratic elite rather than particularly humane contemporaries. Bankers, monarchs, high nobility, industrialists, clerics, eugenicists—they all parked their fortunes in foundations, trusts and funds to lend their often-questionable ideals influence across generations.

Similarly, the unscrupulous banking family Rockefellers contributed significantly to the founding of the UN and even donated the prime property in New York, on which the UN headquarters now stands, to the supranational organization.

What is more interesting is that the UN is implementing the exact same geostrategic ideas that imperialists like the Rockefellers had advocated throughout their lifetimes: centralization of political power in supranational organizations, consolidation of markets into oligopolies, reduction of democratic participation, reduction of the world population, establishment of authoritarian to totalitarian control structures, and sedation and dependence of the masses on the system.

Of course, such controversial goals can only be achieved in the face of immense resistance from the ordinary population, since they serve only a well-heeled caste. And because resorting to violence would make the desired change quite costly, the most efficient way for this group of elites is to get the jaded masses to restrict their own freedoms. Through fake democracy, pseudo-activism, social engineering, propaganda, nudging and infiltration.

This comprises the strategic toolkit, a set of perfidious socio-psychological tools with which the rulers operate. Its implementation became all too clear during the Covid crisis. For example, the fact that the UN has already initiated the next stage of global concentration of power via a new international Pandemic Treaty has gone largely unnoticed by the public. The treaty will grant the democratically illegitimate organization far-reaching powers in the event of a crisis.

In a concerted triad with the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and the World Health Organization, a de facto

world government has already been constituted that eludes any participatory processes and is above national law.

> **"By dividing voters through the political party system, we can get them to put their energy into fighting for unimportant issues." (Montagu Norman, former governor of the Bank of England)**

To ensure that this deliberate manipulation of the masses does not fall back on them, the international oligarchy adorns itself with the deceptive glamour of philanthropy. This is illustrated by the example of Planned Parenthood (PPFA), an organization founded in 1921 as the American Birth Control League, which still offers its services in the fields of family planning, sexual medicine and gynecology throughout the United States.

As innocuous as the name was, as gloomy was the ideals of the founder Margaret Sanger, the avowed supporter of eugenics (racial theory) and forced sterilization of minorities. As recently as 2015, activists accused the PPFA of illegally selling fetal tissue to pharmaceutical companies and performing partial-birth abortions.

Official investigations have been carried out in twelve US states. Three committees in the US Congress dealt with the allegations. And although Planned Parenthood was never convicted, eleven states cut off public funding for the organization. Nevertheless, Planned Parenthood seems to continue to do everything in its power to prevent as much new life as possible.

Of interest, too, is that Bill Gates' father, William Henry Gates, was on the board of the PPFA for years. Perhaps, due to the ideological influence of his parents, his son today constantly talks about overpopulation, reduction of population growth, birth control,

one-child policy and vaccinations, which are supposed to help reduce newborn rates, especially in developing countries. To justify Gates' exuberant activism in the pharmaceutical and health sectors with a humanistic streak seems implausible. After all, Gates himself repeatedly confirms his basic motivation, namely that his investments in this area yield disproportionate returns. And before his image relaunch, the Microsoft founder, who became rich through unfair business methods, was rarely assessed as an outright philanthropist.

But the controversial tech billionaire's philanthropic efforts have also repeatedly caused controversy and scandal in recent years. On August 31, 2014, for example, the *Indian Times* reported in detail on a vaccination campaign in India financed by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. The campaign was accused of manipulating a large part of the written consent forms, of keeping the subjects completely uninformed, and of leading to serious side effects and deaths. About 16,000 girls between the ages of nine and fifteen were given a drug from the company Merck for prophylaxis against cervical cancer. In another province, another 14,000 girls attending schools for Indigenous groups were treated with a similar product from the pharmaceutical giant GlaxoSmithKline. A few months later, many of these children, most of whom came from precarious backgrounds, became seriously ill and some died. The number of unreported cases is high. There are similar reports from Colombia and Africa.

The organization Children's Health Defense, led by Robert F. Kennedy Jr., reports in a well-founded article about up to 490,000 Indian children who have been paralyzed by polio vaccinations. These momentous treatments were financed by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, an organization of unprecedented size whose project portfolio includes about 30,000 investments.

The WHO, too, has been called into question since new polio outbreaks, such as in Sudan, are probably due to one of its vaccination campaigns.

Of course, fact checkers such as Correctiv or the Poynter Institute try to relativize the accusations in superficial articles. Fortunately, their efforts have yielded only limited success, given the unfoundedness of their arguments and, not least, since the Indian government has shown the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation the door after the allegations became known.

> **"A strict and unbending policy of sterilization and segregation is to be applied to those parts of the population whose offspring are corrupt, or whose genetic material is of such a nature that reprehensible traits may be transmitted to the offspring." (Margaret Sanger, "A Plan for Peace" in Birth Control Review, p. 106, 1932)**

However, when considering the effectiveness of NGOs, the operations of associations that are founded and financed directly by governments or intelligence agencies deserve particular interest. This applies, in particular, to the aforementioned USAID, a US agency launched in 1961 that acts in the guise of an NGO and has an annual budget of well over 20 billion US dollars. USAID is active in foreign policy all over the world and is ostensibly committed to disaster control and the strengthening of democratic values in emerging and developing countries.

But this image merely serves as an inviting façade for the imperialist machinations of an agency largely controlled by the CIA. What forms USAID's "strengthening of democratic values" can take is illustrated by astonishing events in Bolivia, where the organization provided $10.5 million to support "political decision-making" in

the country—a euphemism for serious efforts to overthrow the government of President Morales, according to secret documents published by WikiLeaks. Evo Morales expelled USAID from the country in 2013. Similar events can be reported from Venezuela.

Again, according to journalist Eva Golinger, who examined internal US government documents, USAID tried to disempower the incumbent administration. In a 2010 interview with RT, she reports:

"*In the case of Venezuela, we are talking about a country that is rich in oil, so it has never qualified for any kind of direct aid from USAID. As a result, USAID never officially maintained an office here. They only came to the country in 2002 and opened an office, just before the coup d'état against President Chávez. And the documents—internal documents obtained under the Freedom of Information Act—reveal that the sole intention of setting up the office here in Venezuela was to help the opposition forces oust Chávez from office.*"

Even more spectacular are events in Cuba, where USAID developed and rolled out an illegal social media network to stir up social discord among the population and turn it against the government of Fidel Castro, as *THE GUARDIAN* reported in April 2014. After this plan was not successful, USAID sent more agents to Cuba under the pretext of carrying out civil and health protection programs, looking for people who could be considered as revolutionary leaders. *THE GUARDIAN* also reported on this in August 2014.

Even more brazen and embarrassing was USAID's attempt to undermine the Cuban music scene in order to instigate a revolution against Cuba's unpopular socialist government. USAID was also active in Brazil and Uruguay, indeed, as early as the 1970s. An article in the *New York Times* of May 7, 1978, describes how the

CIA-instrumentalized aid program recruited local police forces in both countries to carry out assignments for the CIA and, among others, torture political prisoners. In Laos, USAID financed the supposedly humanitarian airline Xieng Khouang Air Transport.

The company, which operated with two American planes, only helped the controversial CIA man General Vang Po, who supported the Americans from Laos during the Vietnam War, with opium smuggling. The fact that the CIA—and thus also USAID—can look back on a long and frighteningly successful history, especially in drug trafficking, is shown in a detailed summary of the data depository Bibliotheca Pleyades.

Of course, Ukraine, which is currently in the geopolitical spotlight, was not spared either. Right on Russia's doorstep, various NGOs are still working to restructure the region according to their own ideas. For example, investment mogul George Soros, who significantly financed ANTIFA and the scandal-ridden Black Lives Matter movement, thereby massively promoting the division of American civil society, announced in a CNN interview from 2017:

"*I set up a foundation in Ukraine before Ukraine became independent from Russia. The foundation has been functioning ever since and is now playing an important role in current events.*"

A February 2018 article by Mark Ames details how, among others, George Soros and Pierre Omidyar, founder and former head of eBay, supported revolutionary movements in Ukraine to destabilize the country. The fact that the seemingly chaotic situation in Ukraine can be traced back to covert interventions and operations by the West is also described in a detailed lecture (2015) by John Mearsheimer, professor of political science at the University of Chicago.

It is clear that the NATO member states and the NGOs active on the ground were never interested in humanitarian aid or the strengthening of democratic structures in Ukraine—but rather in the expansion and enforcement of the Pax Americana on the Russian border.

This is also evidenced by the activities of the National Endowment for Democracy (NED), an organization that was officially founded by US Congress in the early 1980s and has since been committed to "democratic developments in the target areas." But appearances are likewise deceptive when it comes to the NED. As an article by Robert Parry for *Consortium News* from July 2015 points out, the organization is a CIA vehicle and flagship of the neocons, which is primarily committed to regime change in Russia.

Allen Weinstein, one of the founding members of NED, publicly boasted in the *Washington Post*:

"*Much of what we're doing today was done covertly by the CIA 25 years ago.*"

Former CIA Director William Casey promoted the creation of NED in a memo to the White House, but at the same time cautioned that the CIA would have to operate in the background so as not to discredit the integrity of such an organization:

"*We here [at the CIA] should not be at the forefront of developing such an organization, nor do we want to appear as a sponsor or advocate.*"

The list of inglorious activities of the NED is long. Thus, the organization played an important role in the Iran-Contra affair and was part of Oliver North's shadow government in those years. In 1990, NED tried to rig the elections in Nicaragua to overthrow

President Daniel Ortega. During the same period, the NED made efforts to replace the governments of Albania and Bulgaria. And in the colorful revolutions in Georgia and Kyrgyzstan, both USAID and NED had their fingers in the pie. The same applies to the Orange Revolution in Ukraine or the Electric Yerevan protests in Armenia, as Michael Barker reported in November 2006.

In a conversation held between US politician Ron Paul and journalist Daniel McAdams, the latter made the following statement:

"*That's a big problem. Because I think you could argue that NATO should have ended after the Cold War. But the National Endowment for Democracy should have ended after the Cold War. Instead, as with any government program, they say: No, now we need more. There's an interesting article written by the president of the National Endowment for Democracy, who is president for life, Carl Gershman. I know this may shock you, but he is actually a Trotskyist. He was a founding member of a communist breakaway party, the Trotskyite Social Democrats USA. He wrote an editorial in the Washington Post in September 2013, just before the events in Ukraine took place. And he wrote as president of the National Endowment for Democracy. He said: "Ukraine is the biggest prize." And he mentioned that "Ukraine's decision to join Europe will accelerate the decline of the ideology of Russian imperialism that Putin represents"—and that "Putin may be on the losing side not only with his close neighbors but also in Russia itself." So, the real goal of the NED is regime change. He said that just before all these events took place.*"

The Arab Spring did not come out of nowhere, as the *New York Times* described on April 14, 2011. In the Arab world, too, US interests, the Pax Americana, were of primary concern. Even the US State Department admitted in April 2008 that it had supported activists in the region with more than 50 million US

dollars, helping NGOs such as Movements.org to build networks, communication and protest movements.

In Syria, Anglo-American hegemony has also been covertly active through NGOs since at least 2006. As the CBC reported in April 2011, millions of dollars were sent to the revolutionary forces in Syria through an NGO, the Justice and Development Movement. Even the Syrian Civil Defense, called the White Helmets, a first-responder organization founded by a former British intelligence officer, goes back to the instigation of American imperialists, as renowned investigative journalist Vanessa Beeley explained at the Swiss Press Club in 2017.

In view of the information cited, it is once again clear that a look behind the scenes of fake democracy and international corporatism is necessary, even for supposedly philanthropic projects. Because in addition to NGOs that take their task seriously and actually engage in charitable work, there are also those that serve completely different purposes and thus betray their gullible members, exploit them financially and instrumentalize them.

Moreover, these organizations are influencing the development of modern civil society in an undemocratic way. They flout national jurisprudence while bolstering questionable goals of amoral, financially strong minorities.

Millions of people around the world work in NGOs and want to make the planet a little better. They feel empathy for the poor, the weak, the disadvantaged, with tortured, endangered or abandoned animals and with the maltreated nature. Many activists and volunteers work to the point of self-abandonment based on honest convictions—often even in those organizations that serve a geostrategic agenda in the background.

After all, USAID or NED do, also, ostensibly provide aid in crisis regions for the purpose of legitimacy. In this way, hegemony gains access to countries and regions that remained closed to the amoral imperialists through official channels.

Under the pretext of wanting to provide unselfish help, the unwanted guests create a back door through which they can covertly exert influence on site and manipulate the socio-political situation in their favor.

For example, the unmanageable number of NGOs is not necessarily an enrichment for free and democratic civil society. In quite a few cases, you even have to assume the opposite—or at least critically question what goals are being pursued.

This is especially the case when NGOs become influential corporations, when conflicts of interest or verifiable connections to governments and intelligence agencies become exposed, or when they are shown to have non-transparent mega-budgets and be involved in geostrategically explosive regions of the world. This is demonstrated by Ukraine—a country that may have to serve as a straw man for a NATO war against Russia, namely because imperialist interest groups have manipulated the situation as they see fit and under the pretext of humanitarian aid.

"I like questions that can't be answered better than answers that shouldn't be questioned." (Richard Feynman)

February 14, 2022

Ordo ad Chao

Chaos only benefits those who can create new order out of it. Can we view the protests in Canada or the euphemistically titled Freedom Days for the lifting of Covid measures in various countries in a different light under this premise?

“Defy, and you’ll end up winning.” (Friedrich Hebbel)

Exuberance abounds, with people popping champagne bottles and having parties. In some social media networks, the hopefuls are cheering each other on. The pandemic is over! The hashtag #gameover is circulating. And so are the truckers.

Regrettably, the rejoicing over the imminent end of authoritarian pandemic management is probably premature, because on closer inspection of the circumstances, it quickly becomes clear that nothing has come to an end. The new normal has nothing to do with the time before Covid.

Yes, in many countries the segregative Covid certificate is being abolished, at least temporarily. The measures, which have been more or less strict for two years, are being scaled back. In Germany, the so-called 2G and 3G rules no longer apply, and in some places the mask requirement is also dropped. While some governments are only easing cautiously and gradually, other heads of state are lifting all Covid restrictions at the same time. Each country seems to be doing its own thing in this regard.

The international approach does not appear to be homogeneous. This gives the impression of chaos or different handling of the crisis, depending on the location. This is comparable to the mock battles and staged trench warfare of the German prime ministers before the democratically illegitimate ivory tower conferences on Covid with the incumbent federal chancellor. But the apparent chaos in matters crisis management is deceiving. From a holistic point of view, all countries proceed according to the same scheme.

Admittedly, the current situation initially gives the deceptive impression that the authoritarian system will retreat after the worst is over. Some even believe in a timely legal reappraisal of the deliberately destructive crisis management, institutional corruption and usurpation of office that occurred the past 24 months. Far from it.

No one will take responsibility. No one will be prosecuted and held accountable. If anything, one or the other media pawn will be sacrificed to appease a frightened electorate. In this way, the leading media, which are loyal to the government, are likely to try to anesthetize their obviously hypnotized audience after the panic mode has subsided, before too much resentment ferments among halfway reflective sections of the population.

Despite all the euphoria about the reduction of state encroachments in many countries, selected “hardship cases” such as Germany, Austria or Australia, which are still on a totalitarian course towards universal compulsory vaccination, show what is possible if resistance does not generate sufficient momentum. Despite increasing protests against the increasingly totalitarian emergency policy of the respective government, the government remains stoic in its bearing.

The "creative destruction" continues. A prime example of this mindset is Winfried Kretschmann, who would like to turn the capital of the state of Baden-Württemberg, which he governs, into an outpost of Pyongyang.

Meanwhile, the state's crackdown on demonstrators is becoming increasingly violent, as recent escalating protests in Paris, Brussels and many other cities around the world have shown. Resistance is bludgeoned down. Police violence is on the rise. The atmosphere is heating up and inhibitions are falling, because the aggression is growing.

And in those European countries where a general vaccination requirement is on the table—namely Germany, Austria, Italy and France—the state seems to want to provoke this. At more and more demonstrations, collusion between representatives of the police and alleged rioters and informants is documented.

The fact that the very three states that once marked the spearhead of fascism in Europe in the last century are turning against their citizenship in this way shows that history teaches people nothing. Otherwise, the population would have put an end to the misanthropic activities of the governments months ago. Or a truly functioning democratic system would not have allowed the power-hungry, corrupt representatives of our time to get to this point in the first place.

In the supposedly model democracy United States, with its de facto two-party system, one has already reached the point where critical parts of the population are classified as terrorists. Under this premise, the anti-terror laws enacted after 9/11 now seem to be turning against their own people. This doesn't just apply to the United States, and it's threatening.

At the moment, all that is needed in many places is an "agent provocateur" who makes a name for himself with the use of firearms to provoke veritable social unrest or even a full-blown civil war. In Canada, for example, it was the rightly acclaimed truckers who provided the Ontario administration with an excuse to officially declare a state of emergency—giving the government all the more power and cementing the permanent state of emergency as the future base coordinate for the actions of state leadership circles. On February 15, 2022, the Canadian government also announced that it would block the bank accounts of people who participate in resisting Covid measures. This, after the crowdfunding company GoFundMe had already frozen nine million US dollars that had been donated to the rebellious truck drivers. A scandal.

As a backlash, Canadians have now seemingly started withdrawing their money from banks. Informed circles postulate a bank run. This, in turn, could lead to massive upheavals, currency instability, and the collapse of the Canadian and, as a result, international commercial banking system.

Due to the global interconnectedness of financial markets, a domino effect is likely if the Canadian dollar collapses. Contrary to the opinion of most protesters, however, the result of these developments is not more freedom and the abdication of the corrupt rulers, but a significant increase in the power of the system.

After all, practically all governments in the world have been working towards the introduction of digital currencies—and thus the end of all freedom—for a long time. Central bank digital currencies (CBDCs) are to be introduced soon, be they for Euros, dollars, China's Digital RMB or Swiss francs. Everything is already there or almost ready for rollout.

What has been missing so far is the catalyzing event that increases the acceptance of such a totalitarian monetary system among the population—or creatively destroys the old one. So, the Covid certificate (mandatory proof of vaccination) may be dormant for a summer. That it will soon be reactivated for other purposes, however, is obvious to the informed reader. The example of Switzerland also makes it clear that the certificate—and the associated monitoring structure—will not be abolished under any circumstances. The system is just taking a break.

It's decompressing and letting go of some of the steam from the overheated cauldron. But the infrastructure is in place and will be used again soon.

Either next winter, when the pandemic is back, or when the carbon footprint is recorded via a mandatory app that keeps track of the radius of movement of people. The fact that this is not wild speculation is underlined by a report by INSIDE IT, according to which the Swiss government has invested a further 5.5 million francs in a local Covid app, thus financing it until at least the end of 2023.

Something similar can be heard from the EU Commission, which has announced that it also wants to extend the in-house health certificate until at least July 2023. Without evidence and despite the "summer break" of the killer pandemic.

And it is precisely at this point that the connection between nearly all 194 states of the world becomes evident, even if their crisis management seems anything but homogeneous. A new level of internationally networked, digital-oligarchic surveillance architecture has been installed and will be preserved.

The Covid crisis has set an example. The states have sounded out the red lines of their populations. Always two steps forward and one step back. It will advance until a public outcry can be heard, and then agree to a few more concessions. Nudging. Milgram Experiment. Stockholm syndrome. In this way, even the unthinkable becomes conceivable. Within quite manageable time frames. And after two years, you wonder what has become of us. Or would someone have dared to dream at the end of 2019 that fundamental rights would be degraded to privileges, segregated people, the culture of debate completely perverted and well-known personalities such as Jan Josef Liefers, Max Otte, Lisa Fitz, Nena, Till Schweiger, Eric Clapton , Novak Djokovic or TV legend Harald Schmidt questioned by cancel culture, labeled disloyal and treated as personae non grata? Nevertheless, in February 2022, we have reached exactly this point. It is the point where you can still express your own opinion, but only under the condition that you can deal with the shitstorm that inevitably overtakes you if you have the audacity to publicly disagree with the official narrative.

"If freedom means anything, it's the right to tell people what they don't want to hear." (George Orwell)

In view of the tectonic fault lines that have been driven into the social and communicative structures of modern societies by the Covid crisis, it seems somewhat premature to celebrate a victory over the biosecurity doctrine of the "new normal," which was launched after the turn of the millennium.

Because even though Covid-19 wrapped its rope around the neck of freedom just two years ago, the legislature and technology to be instrumentalized for the final expansion of power had been created by the relevant interest groups long before the current

crisis. Catalyzing events such as Covid-19 or 9/11 ultimately only enable the paradigm shift that the oligarchy's think tanks have been working towards for decades.

This could be observed in the wake of the swine flu, a test run for the Covid pandemic. This was a time when Wolfgang Wodarg was still regarded as a renowned fighter for civil rights even by a newspaper like the *taz*.

Even then, with the help of the WHO, the pharma-financial complex tried to set in motion a domino effect similar to that of 2020 to conjure up a pandemic of biblical proportions through leading media. However, they did not have a PCR test at that time.

The system also did not yet have a good grip on (social) media. In the meantime, things have changed. Thanks to technical progress, financial infiltration of the media landscape and censorship tools such as Germany's Network Enforcement Act. The latter in particular is of immanent importance for the successful illusion of a global pandemic—because the virus is primarily transmitted via screen, and its name is fear.

This insight is not new. Astonishingly, there are amazing parallels between the HIV wave of the 1980s and the supposed Covid pandemic. The HIV virus also caused a media hype. TV stations and newspapers were fascinated by the mysterious new killer virus—of which, like Covid, no isolate exists to this day. In other words, the actual existence of the pathogen has never really been proven.

HIV, like Covid, is only diagnosed indirectly through the presence of indicators. And even the rapid test at that time, like the PCR test today, largely delivered false-positive results.

As early as the 1980s, inflationary testing detected only indirect evidence of a problem—the HIV virus—which was subsequently inflated by the media. Based on the test result, preventive treatment was administered before the virus in question could become active. If the subjects subsequently fell ill, the diagnosis was AIDS, an autoimmune disease which they tried to combat with other drastic methods—to the monetary advantage of the pharmaceutical industry, which earns a golden nose from HIV patients.

The handling of HIV is therefore quite reminiscent of the Covid test-and-vaccination campaign, with its massive side effects, which apparently also cause the body to declare war on itself.

A detailed analysis with dozens of sources on the parallels between the HIV wave and the Covid pandemic was published by journalist Ryan Cristian on February 12, 2022.

Amusing side note: Even then, doubters of the official HIV narrative were called "deniers"—AIDS deniers—as evidenced by a baseless fact check from 2012 on the enlightening documentary "I won't go quietly" by Anne Sono. A detailed, chronological overview of the emergence of the HIV narrative can be found on the website HIV-Fakt.de.

At the moment, it seems quite confusing and unfair that countries such as Switzerland are lifting all Covid measures on February 17, 2022—including mandatory masks—all the while in Germany harsh regulations are being marketed as freedom. The delayed opening steps of the various countries may seem arbitrary, but in the historical context of overarching goals, as is so often the case, overlaps with similar events can be discerned.

In addition to the media narrative that suppresses contrary points of view and the profit-oriented processes of the mafia-like

corporate oligarchy, it is above all the strategic—basically very simple—goals of the acting interest groups that are the same across all the crises mentioned: financial enrichment, control of the population, creation of dependencies against paternalistic corporatism, centralization of power in supranational organizations as well as the equalization of cultural characteristics.

The fact that history repeats itself can be seen not only in armed conflicts, for which crude lies have repeatedly provided an official occasion, but also in the development of the health care system, which is increasingly showing an interest in long-term customer loyalty—in other words, in permanently ill people—instead of working towards a healthy population.

The changes in legislation have also changed over the centuries. In the beginning, there was always self-determination and participation. The well-being of the people. Equality. It often ended in tyranny. Governments have always tried to achieve their often-unpopular goals through emergency laws, martial law or other states of emergency. A well-founded analysis on the topic is provided by the elaborate podcast entitled “States of Emergency” by investigative journalist James Corbett. First aired on February 12, 2022, it draws on research that dates back to the sixteenth century.

From this perspective, the Canadians’ protests seem downright counterproductive, as they give the system legitimacy to exacerbate the conflict and fuel a self-amplifying cycle of escalation. After all, chaos only serves those who can create new order out of it.

Ordo Ad Chao. Regrettably, the joy of the supposedly timely end of the Covid crisis must also end abruptly. The crisis remains. It doesn’t matter which one. It is the essence of modern governance.

Therefore, if you take a closer look, the party is over before it has even started.

After all, all countries have one thing in common—whether they lift Covid measures or not—and no matter how restrictive they have been in dealing with the crisis: they are developing themselves and their societies along the lines of the Chinese model and are planning to introduce a social credit system. If anything, the country-specific sales strategy for this political terminus is slightly adapted to the respective clientele in order to increase the chances of success in implementation.

Even today, the Western world is much closer to socialism than real democracy or market liberalism.

Perhaps Angela Merkel suspected as early as 2015 what Europe was heading towards when she said, addressing the Social Democratic Party (SPD):

"*Socialism ends in totalitarianism. Whether you like it or not.*"

Now more than ever, resistance to the empowering oligarchic caste must be peaceful. The opposition must be aware of the scope of the real problem and must not allow itself to be blinded by supposed relaxations that provide the system with a legitimizing line of argumentation. Because during the lifting of measures, governments and the media will now try to punish those who had admonished the construction of undemocratic, totalitarian structures over the past two years.

The supposed return to normality is an obvious feint—even if the arrival of spring lifts the mood and a halfway carefree summer should be in the offing.

February 21, 2022

Bioethics: The Eugenics of Late Modernity

During the Covid crisis, Germany's so-called Ethics Council repeatedly irritated with statements that have little to do with the traditional understanding of ethics. A closer look at the field of research and its inglorious history implies why.

"The way of nature has always been to slay the hindmost, and there is still no other way, unless we can prevent those who would become the hindmost being born. It is in the sterilization of failure, and not in the selection of successes for breeding, that the possibility of an improvement of the human stock lies." (H.G. Wells, 1904)

Ethics councils: An institution that has been at the center of the discussion about the right to physical integrity in many countries during the Covid crisis and that has often caused a stir in this regard. This applies to Germany as well as to Switzerland and Austria.

After all, many of the statements made by this supposedly final authority in matters of socio-political morality raised the question: What does such an ethics council member actually do for a living?

This question now also seems to be addressed by an article (paywall) of the *WELT* of February 21, 2022, which is concerned

about the independence of the controversial German Ethics Council head Alena Buyx, who apparently has ties to the Wellcome Trust—the world's most powerful private foundation in the field of medical research based in London.

In the introduction to her contribution, the author, Cornelia Stolze, aptly describes the conflict of interest that exists when a supposedly independent body, which lends ethical and moral legitimacy to the controversial crisis policy of governments, is said to be financially dependent on organizations that ultimately benefit from a persistent health emergency.

However, Ms Stolze could have known as early as June 2021 what financial resources the Wellcome Trust has, what kind of brainchild founder Henry Wellcome was, what dystopian research goals the institution pursues and what influence it has at the government level. This is because at that time, investigative journalist Whitney Webb published her comprehensive and well-researched editorial "A 'Leap' toward Humanity's Destruction," which deals in detail with the questionable research priorities of the supposedly charitable foundation and its DARPA-affiliated spin-off "Wellcome Leap."

The Wellcome Trust's proximity to the pharmaceutical industry could also have been known, as the group of its namesake, Sir Henry Solomon Wellcome, was one of the four companies that merged to form GlaxoSmithKline in 2000.

Before the merger, it was still called "Glaxo Wellcome." And apart from the now well-known Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, hardly any other organization has had more influence on the course of the pandemic than Sir Henry's ostensibly philanthropic legacy.

In addition, the Wellcome Trust's proximity to Oxford-AstraZeneca or DARPA, as well as the proven links of these organizations to the eugenics movement, should have raised questions—because Whitney Webb had already reported on this in detail on December 26, 2020.

So, if Ms Buyx has any connections to the Wellcome Trust or Wellcome Leap, not only must the public know about it in a timely manner, but the head of the Ethics Council should also resign promptly.

Dependencies on an organization that has made it its top priority to massively promote invasive technologies, individualized gene therapy (especially for children), telemedicine and transhumanism by 2030 are hardly acceptable as an independent thinker on behalf of ethics.

After all, the activities of the Wellcome organizations have little to do with charity, morality and ethics. This is likely to be implied by the close cooperation with the American DARPA (Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency), whose billion-dollar programs ranging from "Active Social Engineering Defense" to "Pandemic Prevention Platform P3" to "Warfighter Analytics using Smartphones for Health" paint a bleak picture of the future that the US military is blatantly scheming.

After all, abbreviations such as P3 stand for nothing more than the mRNA platform concept for permanent gene therapy, which apparently promotes autoimmune diseases, and which critics of the "vaccination" against SARS-Cov-2 have long warned against. And many DARPA projects also focus on social control, invasive pharmacology, biometric surveillance, and the fusion of man and machine: hardly the right environment for fundamental ethical questions.

In addition to the socio-political farce surrounding the seemingly cornered Ms. Buyx and the possible receiving of benefits or conflicts of interest on the part of the Ethics Council, it seems appropriate to take a closer look at the field of bioethics.

For a large number of indications give every reason to believe that behind the seemingly objective description of a lofty liberal arts field lies nothing more than a new edition of eugenic ideas that were generally hoped to have been left at the stake of history after the Second World War.

The factual definition of the research field of bioethics does not read very threateningly at first. Even if controversial topics such as red and green genetic engineering, stem cell research or reproductive medicine are touched upon in the superficial description—but that's what bioethicists are officially there for: for the development of recommendations for action, models of thought and enlightened grounded guidelines that keep *Homo sapiens* on an ethical and moral course in the context of the developments of his time.

In short, bioethicists are supposed to ensure, on a theoretical level, that man reflects on his development and knows how to protect himself from his own progress—even if his revolutionary developments tempt him to endanger him and his own existence. We think only of nuclear weapons, or human cloning.

Some may still vaguely remember the first cloned sheep Dolly (1996–2003). Although technically possible for a long time, it is ethically and morally, and thus also socially, still absolutely unthinkable. This is thanks to the corresponding public discussion, which is based on humanistic enlightenment and has so far marked a halfway stable barrier against such projects. Otherwise, the pharmaceutical

industry would have started to become active in this field a long time ago, or rather, more active, insofar as it has been secretly involved. In a text dated November 10, 2021, I have already outlined the plans that the pharmacological-financial complex has for the future of medicine, and consequently for the future of the human organism. In any case, it has little to do with health in the conventional sense.

With the Covid-19 vaccination, mRNA products are currently being put into circulation on a large scale for the first time and tested on human beings.

The injections are a gene therapy, no more and no less, and thus represent a paradigm shift not only in pharmacological development but also in a sociological context. Hence, the outcry of those believing in the government pandemic narrative was initially great when those critical of the narrative described the mRNA treatments as risky gene therapy. After all, interfering with the human cell structure is rightly frowned upon in all milieus.

Consequently, such designations were dismissed as conspiracy theories—mRNA is not DNA. This has nothing to do with genetic manipulation. Even today, search engine results are dominated by fact checks from the usual suspects who go out of their way to justify how and why the Covid vaccinations differ from gene therapies, or that they can't be considered as such.

The media is desperately trying to marginalize the ethical taboo and distract from a drastic paradigm shift. All the while, documents from vaccine manufacturers and websites from official institutions themselves use the term gene therapy.

And when denial and whitewashing ceases to be a viable option, with many people having suspected that it is about the modification

of the human genome, they simply admit the circumstance, as does the Alliance for Science, when it says, in so many words, "*Yes, some Covid vaccines modify genes. But so what? Who cares.*" As if nothing was wrong with tearing down the boundaries of ethically justifiable treatment methods. EU Commission President Ursula von der Leyen, who recently proposed abolishing the Nuremberg Code, adopt the same stance. This is outrageous and should be an absolute no-go, if anything has been learned from history. And yet, this makes it clear where the journey is headed. And whether it's the National Library of Medicine or Astra Zeneca's product description, the product documentation on Covid vaccination is clear:

> **"One dose (0.5 ml) contains: chimpanzee adenovirus encoding SARS-CoV-2 spike glycoproteins ChAdOx1-S*, no less than 2.5 × 108 infectious units*. Produced in genetically modified human embryonic kidney cells (HEK) 293 and with recombinant DNA technology." (Astra Zeneca)**

The Covid conformists seem to have come to terms with the fact that they were first lied to and then subjected to experimental gene therapy. This removes the ethical-moral barrier mentioned at the beginning of this article, which has so far prevented the pharmaceutical industry, the military and big tech from actively manipulating the source code of human life.

This is because a part of the population has now obviously accepted this path as normal—or can no longer go back. And what does the Ethics Council do? It discusses the age at which children should be vaccinated and under what aspects a general obligation to vaccinate is justifiable. This, in the face of a disease with a mortality rate in the per thousand range and a vaccination that neither provides sterile immunity nor protects against severe disease. Mission unaccomplished.

Now, however, the mRNA platform, including quarterly booster updates, seems to be only a first step. Because what the bioethicists are discussing beyond that is making people sit up and take notice. The ethics committees and moral task forces are not only in the process of wresting semantic tricks from language in order to invalidate inalienable human rights and pervert traditional values in terms of communication, but they are also trying to deny the value of life itself.

> **"(...) That's a compromise that society is making because of very high medical costs and unwillingness to say: Is it worth a million dollars to spend on the last three months of a patient's life—or wouldn't it be better not to fire those ten teachers and make this compromise on medical costs? But that's called the Death Panel—and you're not supposed to have that discussion." (Bill Gates)**

Thus, the German Ethics Council's line of discussion now gives voice to ideas that have little to do with humanism. The Council's lines of argument follow the needs of hegemony. Just like the STIKO, the RKI or the Federal Constitutional Court. On behalf of a misanthropic idea, Buyx and company are trying to make the unthinkable conceivable, as the eugenicist and first head of UNESCO, Julian Huxley, put it.

The Ethics Council is supposed to ethically justify what was considered science 100 years ago and had high-ranking supporters from America to Europe: eugenics. The human genetic segregation of the population. The optimized, selective and centrally controlled reproduction of humans. Comparable to livestock breeding and factory farming.

And, contrary to popular belief, it was not the insane small-minded Adolf Hitler who invented eugenics. In fact, the British

and Americans were pioneers in this field. Not even the Hitler salute was invented by the German despot and mass murderer himself. The gesture originated in the United States, is called "Bellamy Salute" and was used there from 1892 until the 1930s to pay homage to the American flag. And Hitler's *Mein Kampf* was not really written by him either. The racist concoction is largely based on the four-part publication *The International Jew*, which was published by the American industrialist and staunch anti-Semite Henry Ford (Ford Motor Company) in the 1920s. Even the racial hygiene proclaimed by Hitler had not grown on his own dung. The concept was developed by the Swiss human geneticist Ernst Rüdin, who was acting head of the Institute for Racial Hygiene in Munich from 1936 to 1944. As late as 1943, when it had long been known that Hitler was using the idea of racial hygiene as a justification for the industrialized mass murder of the Jews, Rüdin wrote:

"*It is the imperishable historical merit of Adolf Hitler and his followers to have dared to take the first groundbreaking and decisive step, beyond purely scientific knowledge, towards the ingenious act of racial hygiene in and on the German people.*"

Ernst Rüdin was classified as a "less incriminated person" in the denazification proceedings of the victorious powers and was released in 1946 at the zealous instigation of the German physicist and Nobel Prize winner Max Planck. Although he was stripped of his Swiss citizenship in 1945, Rüdin never had to answer for his convictions and actions in court after his release. On the contrary, his daughter, Edith Zerbin-Rüdin, also became a human geneticist and worked in this field until her death in 2015.

In the obituary published by the Max Planck Institute for Psychology in 1952 after Rüdin's death, it was stated that the proven

racist and anti-Semite had been one of the "*most outstanding founders of genetic research in psychiatry*." Indeed, there are many different types of historical awareness.

After the fascists succeeded in Europe and adapted not only the raised right arm but also the racial laws of the Americans in the 1930s, the greeting sign was quickly forgotten on the other side of the ocean.

However, racial segregation and eugenics continued to adhere to the land of opportunity. An informative interview on the gruesome history of eugenics in the United States was given by author Adam Cohen on June 21, 2016. The fact that the United States Supreme Court approved forced sterilizations as late as 1927 speaks volumes. Over the next few decades, more than 70,000 people in the United States were sterilized by government order because they were not considered worthy of reproduction. Most of them were natives, descendants of the Native American tribes.

> **"(...) I object to all punishment whatsoever. I don't want to punish anybody, but there are an extraordinary number of people who I want to kill. Not in any unkind or personal spirit. But it must be evident to all of you, you must all know half a dozen people at least, who are no use in this world; who are more trouble than they are worth. And I think it would be a good thing to make everybody come before a properly appointed board just as he might come before the income tax commissioners and say every 5 years or every 7 years, just put them there, and say, sir or madam, now will you be kind enough to justify your existence?" (George Bernard Shaw)**

Eugenics was an integral part of the political-ideological agenda of the United States and Britain at the beginning of the twentieth century. There were dozens of organizations that dealt with the issue in depth and publicly. Eugenics congresses were held.

Illustrious guests such as Winston Churchill, Arthur Balfour, Vernon Kellogg and Alexander Graham Bell, the inventor of the telephone and founder of AT&T, came to talk about the topic. Financially strong research institutions were concerned with the selective optimization of humanity through breeding and genetic manipulation.

At the time, the elites were unashamedly discussing how to end lives they considered inferior prematurely, or better yet, to prevent them.

Racial segregation in the United States also persisted until well after World War II. However, the assumption that these dark machinations are the mere relic of a deluded past is wrong. After all, most of the eugenics organizations of that time still exist today. They have only changed their name and their public appearance. The ideas and goals are the same. Even if these are now being discussed under the label of bioethics and implemented with other marketing methods.

For example, the Population Council, an NGO founded by John D. Rockefeller in 1952, still exists today under the same name. The website of the organization, which has an annual budget of 74 million US dollars and employs more than 500 people, offers insight about the actual objective behind its ostensibly humanitarian pursuit in its “Our Research” section.

The Rockefellers were and still are energetic advocates of eugenic ideas is well known and documented. The bank magnates financed

the German Kaiser Wilhelm Institute and the eugenics programs of the National Socialists until the United States entered the war.

The Rockefeller clan's attitude toward human life is best exemplified by a quote from one of their closest collaborators, Heinz Alfred Kissinger, better known as Henry Kissinger, who once said:

"*The old are useless eaters.*"

This is exactly what the eugenicists are all about: those who cannot or do not want to be in their service, those who are too old, sick or disabled, must disappear. And "disappear" stands unapologetically for death. This became clear in 1914 at the latest, when the Birth Control Movement became active in America.

I had already reported on the eugenics and racial hatred motives of the frontwoman, Margaret Sanger, as well as her despicable activities in my text The Trojan Herd. It was she who founded the American Birth Control League in 1921, an organization that still exists today under the name Planned Parenthood and is active throughout America.

But that's not all. Margaret Sanger also initiated the establishment of the International Planned Parenthood Foundation, which was launched in Mumbai in 1952 together with Lady Rama Rau. In line with its own agenda—the prevention of new life—the still-active organization is currently celebrating on its website the fact that Colombia decriminalized abortion a few days ago through a change in the law. In essence, therefore, the Foundation is applauding the state's authorization to kill unborn life. With all due respect for the right of every woman to bodily self-determination, the digital frenzy of joy over the decision seems macabre when considering the historical context of the foundation and the convictions of

its founder—even if Planned Parenthood today makes an effort to have a positive and humanitarian *appearance*. Perhaps this flimsy façade explains why no one has been upset about the fact that a street in New York is still named after Margaret Sanger.

It is hardly different with the American Eugenics Society, which was founded in the United States in 1926 and existed until 1972. This organization also exists up to this day and now operates under the title Society for Biodemography and Social Biology. Apart from the name, however, little has apparently been changed. In addition, there was the Human Betterment Foundation in America, which was officially liquidated after the death of its founder, Ezra Seymour Gosney, in 1942—but whose assets and work were absorbed into the Gosney Research Fund, which, together with the archives of the eugenics organization for the betterment of humankind, is still managed by Caltech in Pasadena, California, one of the most prestigious universities in the United States.

In 1906, the Race Betterment Foundation was also established. By Irving Fisher, Charles Davenport and, above all, John Harvey Kellogg, whose name is known from the corresponding food brand "Kellogg's," which he founded together with his brother under the name "Battle Creek Food Company." The next time you buy cornflakes, you should think carefully about whose ideas you are supporting with the purchase of breakfast cereals.

Charles Davenport also established the ERO, the Eugenics Record Office, for the United States during the public heyday of eugenics, whose mission was to collect biological and social information about the American population.

The ERO was founded in 1910 with funds from the Carnegie Institution for Science, which still exists today and manages assets

of a staggering 927 million US dollars (as of June 2020). And even though the Eugenics Record Office was officially dissolved in 1939, the Carnegie Endowment for Science still maintains a separate department for human genetics and works on projects such as the Digital Genome.

> **"The moment we face it frankly we are driven to the conclusion that the community has a right to put a price on the right to live in it ... If people are fit to live, let them live under decent human conditions. If they are not fit to live, kill them in a decent human way. Is it any wonder that some of us are driven to prescribe the lethal chamber as the solution for the hard cases which are at present made the excuse for dragging all the other cases down to their level, and the only solution that will create a sense of full social responsibility in modern populations?"**
> **(George Bernard Shaw)**

But eugenics does not only look back on a long tradition in the United States. The fact that from 1912 until at least the mid-1930s there was even an International Federation of Eugenics Organizations proves that this is an internationally networked movement. Supposedly, the Federation dissolved over time due to internal differences.

However, there is no official date, document or statement on the dissolution. The fact that the American Eugenics Society existed until 1972 allows speculation as to whether it did not finally take on the roles of the international federation after the field of research fell into disrepute due to Hitler's genocide of the Jews. In any case, the management team was staffed by the same people.

On the other side of the world, Australia owes its first obstetric clinic to the eugenicists. It was founded in 1933 by the Racial Hygiene Association of New South Wales, which campaigned for the eradication of various hereditary diseases through selective breeding. In addition, the Australian eugenics organization wanted to ensure that disabled or intellectually less gifted people were generally not allowed to reproduce and that an aptitude test was carried out before each pregnancy—all that to breed the perfect human being and eradicate the Aboriginal people.

Eugenic approaches were en vogue, especially in Great Britain. To this day, the Galton Institute is still working on the genetic optimization of humans. It was founded in 1907 by Francis Galton, a cousin of Charles Darwin, and was originally called The Eugenics Education Society. In 1926 the name was changed to the Eugenics Society. From 1909 to 1968, the organization published the journal *The Eugenics Review*. This (peer-reviewed) publication, despite its past, actually still exists today—but is now available under the less disreputable name *Journal of Biosocial Science*.

How deeply rooted the misanthropic ideology of racial hygiene is in the United Kingdom is also described by *English Heritage*, which summarizes the history of eugenics in Great Britain with a detailed overview, and by an article by *THE GUARDIAN* of February 17, 2012, which also deals with the history of the movement and concludes that the former fascination of socialists with eugenic ideas is not a relic of bygone times and that there has been no active reappraisal of this dark past.

However, author Jonathan Friedland overlooks the reason why there can be no reappraisal: eugenics has never been abolished, ended, buried, or declared null and void.

Canada, as an offshoot of the Commonwealth, is therefore not free of eugenic influence. Among other things, the Canadian Socialists formed the League for Social Reconstruction in 1932. It officially ceased its activities in 1942. In the mid-1940s, however, core members switched to the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation (CCF), a federal social democratic party of Canada.

In this context, the history of the Trudeau family is also interesting. The father of the incumbent Canadian president already benefited from emergency laws and was also an avowed supporter of eugenic ideas as well as the Fabian Society, a socialist organization founded in 1884 with about 8,000 members and based in London. This is reported by Unlimited Hangout in an extensive article on the current situation in Canada on February 17, 2022.

In a text published on June 19, 2009, Anton Chaitkin, historian and author, sheds light on the parallels between the Nazi euthanasia programs and the health policy of US President Obama. Under the Obama administration, ideas were promoted that are still not sufficiently discussed in public today, because their implications are poorly understood. In the United States, the primary question was whether euthanasia for senior citizens should be legalized in general. To make room for the next generation and reduce healthcare costs for the benefit of all Americans.

The most prominent proponent of these aberrant strategies under Obama was Ezekiel Jonathan Emanuel, an obscure physicist from Chicago with more than questionable views on life—and death. Emanual also met with Donald Trump in 2017 and was recently appointed by incumbent US President Joe Biden to his COVID-19 Advisory Board. Emanuel is a man of influence, which, with his beliefs, creates quite an unsettling feeling. Because he is not the last of his kind.

Through the supposedly harmless bioethics, the concept of eugenics is once again penetrating into the center of society as well as our everyday lives and undermining the values of the liberal-democratically constituted civil society.

That was probably what Anton Chaitkin thought when he confronted Ezekiel Emanuel with questions at a press conference in 2009:

Dr. Ezekiel Emanuel and other avowed cost-cutters on this panel also lead a propaganda movement for euthanasia headquartered at the Hastings Center, of which Dr. Emanuel is a fellow. They shape public opinion and the medical profession to accept a death culture, such as the Washington state law passed in November to let physicians help kill patients whose medical care is now rapidly being withdrawn in the universal health disaster. Dr. Emmanuel's movement for bioethics and euthanasia and this council's purpose directly continue the eugenics movement that organized Hitler's killing of patients and then other costly and supposedly "unworthy" people."

In an article on eugenics and euthanasia programs, Chaitkin continued:

"*Eugenics practices that we saw and discussions and preparations for eugenics, which were going on in the United States in the early 1920s and earlier going back to the late 19th century—those discussions were carried over—and the same discussions and preparations in England—were carried over into Nazi Germany. After the war—after World War II—people who had participated in these movements wanted to keep the eugenics idea alive and with the backing of particularly the Rockefeller Foundation—which had backed Nazi eugenics before World War II in Europe—they set up a population control movement that overlapped with the Eugenics Society and*

with eugenics ideas. And out of that combination of eugenics and population control was born the institutes and programs which are today at the heart of what's called "bioethics," where you decide—so, supposedly decide—ethical questions in a medical practice based on supposedly limited resources.
So it's a completely phony and morally disgusting field in general. It's ill-born at the root of it and it's a practice which has never confronted—in the medical community and in the academic community that has this as part of its, you know, its practice—they've never confronted the basis for the existence of this "bioethics."

The list of organizations that have dealt with human genetic segregation and continue to do so today is incredibly long. Over the past hundred years, thousands of influential personalities have worked to make the idea of eugenics socially acceptable. It is primarily about the selective breeding of a dominant as well as a submissive human race, about the forced sterilization of minorities, the sick and otherwise disadvantaged, as well as about the euthanasia of "inferior" life.

Eugenics supporters are convinced that the decision about life and death should be made by an independent body—in the spirit of George Bernard Shaw's bizarre ideas—and what institution would be better suited than the German Ethics Council, which has risen to new heights and consolidated its position in the public consciousness in the wake of a supposed pandemic and which, as part of the supposed discourse on triage, vaccinations and obligations, has already been able to practice how the "death panel" can best gain acceptance among the population.

The Canadian website Eugenics Archive, an elaborate and technically sophisticated web archive, shows how extensive and persistent the concepts of eugenics are to this day. The site has

made it its mission to refute those concepts, ostensibly, so that evil cannot resurge from oblivion.

However, the wording of some of the texts in the archive—as well as the composition of the team, which only includes people of the same skin color—raises justified doubts about this mission. Some historical descriptions of the circumstances sound too neutral or even positive. If one wanted to seriously combat this fascistic ideology, one would perhaps give it less space instead of setting up a fancy platform and having an extensive team work on the *preservation* of eugenics. The analysis of the archive alone triggers oppressive feelings, because the large number of organizations and people who supported such inhumane ideas is shocking. What is even more grotesque is that many of the organizations and families mentioned continue to do so today and have merely given themselves a new coat of paint for their public appearance in late modernity.

Moreover, eugenics must be understood in the context of geo-political hegemony, for the proponents of these ideas are not only concerned with the breeding of a master and slave race. The overarching goal of the respective elites has always been a homogeneous, global structure of domination that overcomes the concept of nation-states and universally recognized human rights.

This is made clear by another quote:

"*It is the system of nationalist individualism that must disappear. We are living at the end of the line of sovereign states. In the great struggle to bring about a Westernized world socialism, contemporary governments could disappear. Countless people will hate the New World Order—and die if they protest against it.*" (H.G. Wells, Open Conspiracy, 1928)

With the start of a supposedly Russian war of aggression in Ukraine, which has the potential to develop into world war number three, the hegemonic power structures now seem to be taking a significant step closer to their overarching goal after the Covid crisis has subsided. Because the greater the chaos, the more powerful the system becomes.

The latest proof of this is the WHO's new order for a global vaccination passport placed at Deutsche Telekom. As Covid leaves, Russia enters. Crisis is the fuel of totalitarianism. And its ideology, presented in the media by fake democracy and pseudo-humanists, is neither right-wing nor left-wing but simply inhumane and lethal.

If the concepts of the new edition of eugenics, euphemistically referred to as bioethics, as well as the already existing supranational organizational structures of the Fourth Industrial Revolution, prevail in the long term, *Homo sapiens* will face dark times. After all, there are no external forces in sight that could come to the aid of the human species, should it ever be completely inferior to the new biological-digital global governance. It's an endgame.

February 27, 2022

Crisis – or War?

The Free State of Bavaria is already using the Ukraine crisis to extend the state of emergency declared because of Covid. There is a war going on. And the burning question these days is: How far will the spiral of escalation turn?

"Only a crisis—be it real or perceived—brings about real change. When this crisis occurs, the actions taken will depend on the ideas that are available at the time." (Milton Friedmann, US Secretary of Commerce and author)

Hot or cold? At the moment, this question arises less in relation to a drink, the temperature of the shower water or a new travel destination, but rather regarding the progress of the Ukraine crisis, whose escalation spiral continues blithely. Thus, the Covid cult is seamlessly followed by an ensuing catastrophe that can put the population into blind hysteria. For the first time since the end of the Cold War, the question is whether Europe could become a theater of war for the great powers.

Is the conflict really boiling down to a hot war between NATO and Russia—or is it primarily a media sham battle between the imperialist power blocs, an intangible war that justifies the ongoing state of emergency without ever coming to an end—just as described by George Orwell in *1984*? There are indications for both scenarios.

While the Omicron variant increasingly took the wind out of the sails of the pandemic situation, the corporate media and political caste struggled to keep the panic level high among the population. The health crisis lost momentum. And even though politicians in Germany are working on the introduction of a general vaccination requirement, regardless of all scientific findings and the dropping of mandates by other countries, the conviction spread in many places that normal life from the times before Covid was finally within reach again.

In countries such as England, Switzerland or Denmark, this is indeed the case. Except for warnings, plexiglass panes and a variable percentage of the population still wearing masks, everyday life in these countries feels almost like it was before. But appearances are deceiving. It is the calm before the storm—or the eye of the hurricane. It depends.

Thus, the promising weeks of relief between the suspension or reduction of the Covid measures and the flare-up of a military conflict on Russia's doorstep were probably only a breather on the dark path to the 2030 Agenda. The mainstream media abruptly changed the focus of their reporting. Instead of reporting on a supposed killer virus, the Ukraine conflict was now the omnipresent topic.

What did not change one bit compared to the Covid crisis was the one-sided, tendentious and propagandistic presentation of a highly complex issue. The culprit was immediately identified, and the indoctrination machine began to run at full speed. The flags of the masses turned with the direction of the wind, abruptly and apparently without much reflection. On social media, the syringe and mask emojis were swapped for Ukraine flags and doves of peace. The delusion remained. But the inherent self-loathing of "Homo Consumens," increasingly frustrated by his inconsequential,

homogeneous existence, is now obviously being projected onto a new enemy: Putin. Because the stately criers have proclaimed it so. And the self-proclaimed do-gooders of postmodernism follow the call of the system—like the Pied Piper of Hamelin.

The media narrative shifts up a gear, including even a sanctions tracker, which the propaganda bards of Correctiv immediately activated. Appeals for donations for Ukraine are launched. On Facebook, Twitter and Instagram, there is a hail of expressions of solidarity with the supposed heroes of the divided country, who bravely throw themselves against the Russian dictator and his bloodthirsty invasion. In the meantime, he is compared to Hitler by well-known magazines, something that had actually been a taboo in mainstream journalism up to that point. But in times of war, everything is allowed. And the truth is always his first victim.

"The monopolies of the mind—manipulated by opening and closing the taps for the neurotransmitter dopamine—is a frightening idea." (Bob Garfield, American Manifesto)

For example, contrary to the otherwise strict corporate guidelines for content that critics of the Covid measures, particular, were subjected to over the past two years, Facebook now temporarily allows calls for violence—provided they are directed against the right enemy: Vladimir Putin and Russian soldiers. This means that sheer hatred and direct calls for physical violence are acceptable and calls for murder are okay as long as they are directed against the image of the enemy proclaimed by the state and the mainstream media. The question is, after the unvaccinated and Russians, which demographic group will be the next to be pilloried—and at some point, persecuted by a hysterically incited lynch mob?

Until a few weeks ago, the Russian patriarch appeared to be an important partner of the World Economic Forum, which has been at the center of a comprehensive socio-economic transformation since the beginning of the virus craze with its technocratic strategies for a realignment of the global order. Vladimir Putin was considered a close confidant of Klaus Schwab, the founder of the WEF, and was mentioned by the latter as a former member of the company's own "promotion of young talent"—the club of useful idiots known today as the Young Global Leaders, whose members are unleashed on humanity after five years of indoctrination by mentors of the corporate oligarchy to be used in the politico-media soap opera, which is sold to the digitized society as a reality, to succeed in supporting roles.

As recently as October 2021, the World Economic Forum considered Moscow to be the "hot spot" of the Fourth Industrial Revolution, as the construction of a post-factual feudal society is euphemistically called by the globalist circle from Davos. Search engines spit out pages and pages of photos in which Schwab and Putin meet each other extremely benevolently. Russia has also dutifully supported the internationally synchronized Covid measures, at least officially. Then there was a U-turn. Diplomatic skirmishes between Russia and the West are on the rise. Ultimatums are issued. And seemingly out of nowhere, the renegade from Moscow orders its troops to invade Ukraine—according to the short-sighted reading of the official narrative.

However, the fact that Ukraine has been massively infiltrated by the United States since at least 2014 is elegantly omitted while reporting. U.S. President Joe Biden himself boasted of his successful influence on the ground when he spoke about the issue at the Council of Foreign Relations. This was after having previously successfully lobbied for the removal of a Ukrainian

prosecutor who was investigating his second son—Hunter Biden. Even in the mainstream, one could not avoid reporting on the obviously questionable connections between the Biden family and influential circles in Ukraine (and China), as demonstrated by a rather superficial article by the BBC from April 6, 2021.

However, the entanglements of the corrupt Biden clan are only the tip of the iceberg. I have already outlined how extensive the influence of the United States in Ukraine has actually been for at least a decade in a text dated February 19, 2022, which describes how various NGOs have been active on Russia's doorstep for years to bring about regime change in Ukraine and to enforce further US interests. Among other things, the National Endowment for Democracy—a CIA-affiliated organization with virtually unlimited financial resources and a director appointed for life, who likes to boast that the NED makes possible today what the CIA would have had to do 25 years ago: regime change and the nefarious, geopolitical implementation of the Pax Americana.

> **"The smart way to keep people passive and obedient is to strictly limit the range of acceptable opinions but allow for very lively debate within that spectrum." (Noam Chomsky)**

In complete ignorance of all these quite relevant backgrounds, the powers in be are now publicly distancing themselves from Russia, breaking off all relations, publishing statements and condemning the invasion in the strongest possible terms. In that context, solidarity is once again heralded and abused, as was done during the Covid crisis. Putin or NATO, black or white. And anyone who doubts, asks questions or wants to look at the situation holistically is a heretic, Nazi or Putin sympathizer.

For days, the WEF has been eagerly deleting content related to Putin from its own homepage. And the public hatred of everything that is Russian knows no bounds.

The mob's blind solidarity with Ukraine turns its rabid foaming supporters into exactly what they claim to be fighting—fascists. Supermarket chains are delisting products of Russian origin, banks are freezing the accounts of Russian businessmen, seven commercial banks from Putin's empire have been excluded from the SWIFT system, doctors are refusing to treat Russians, landlords are not renewing leases, and the content of RT and Sputnik is being censored at the insistence of the EU.

This is, supposedly, censorship for a good cause, and calls for violence against the common enemy are sanctioned by official bodies. The blatant double standard that is being used to argue is an insult to the intelligence of any halfway informed person. While the United States as well as other NATO states and their allies are constantly waging wars in violation of international law—and while the EU is incidentally making supranational censorship and expropriation of personal property socially acceptable—the terror regimes in Moscow, Pyongyang or Beijing are accused of totalitarianism by precisely these institutions. A farce.

So how is the overall situation to be classified? Is Putin the aggressor? What course is likely? And who is to blame? Is it NATO that, contrary to all the agreements of the 1980s, has incessantly pushed ahead with the eastward expansion of the military alliance?

Is it the United States, which apparently operates 26 bio-laboratories on Vladimir Putin's doorstep? The existence of these laboratories was at first vehemently denigrated as a conspiracy

theory, until, a mere three days later, the WHO publicly warned that Ukraine must destroy the "substances" in the said laboratories so that they are not released or fall into the hands of the invaders.

Why does the Ukrainian president constantly call for NATO to enter the war by advocating the establishment of a militarily secured no-fly zone over his country? Why are there so few official videos from the war zone, while in the Gulf War virtually all missile launches were captured on film and one had the feeling that there was an "embedded journalist" in every US tank?

Where are all the moving images from millions of Ukrainian smartphones? Why are demonstrably false images used for war reporting in the mainstream media? Of people who have already died in Libya, Yemen or other wars, of burning factories in China that are designated as Russian bombing targets, or of bombed high-rise buildings from the Arab world?

Why do journalists such as ex-*Focus* employee Boris Reitschuster or former *BILD* editor-in-chief Julian Reichelt, who had attracted positive attention in the context of the Covid crisis by critically questioning the events, suddenly report completely one-sidedly and ignore both NATO's creeping eastward expansion and the covert influence and corruption of US hegemony in Ukraine?

"Journalism means bringing something that others don't want to be published. Everything else is PR."
(George Orwell)

Why does Europe show solidarity with the historically corrupt government in Ukraine, when it, like its belligerent Azov Battalion, has been associated with Nazi ideology and its symbolism in

the past, not only by the media outlet RT but also by Western newspapers such as the Tagesspiegel? Why does NATO post photos of Ukrainian soldiers wearing a black sun on its social media channels, only to delete them a short time later?

Who governs Ukraine anyway? How did actor and comedian Zelensky become a leader? Who is ultimately responsible for the chaos? Have China and Russia come to an agreement and are seriously standing up to the West? Will NATO declare the Alliance's case when the catalyzing event occurs? Who benefits from all this? And above all, what are we to make of the saber-rattling of the great powers and the increasing discussions about rearmament, nuclear weapons and a Third World War?

Helmut Schmidt, former Chancellor of the SPD who died in 2015, once described his understanding of the North Atlantic defense alliance NATO as follows:

"*Sometimes we hear that we have to participate in military interventions out of solidarity within the NATO alliance. The argument fits better into the Nibelungen saga than into today's reality. After all, the North Atlantic Alliance was and is a defensive alliance, not an alliance to reshape the world. As long as it remains a defensive alliance, it is desirable because necessary for an emergency. But we should not be involved in turning it into an instrument for the transformation of foreign states, even if some politicians or writers present such things as an expression of global political responsibility. Wherever there is talk of global political responsibility, one has to examine what the actual motives are.*" (Helmut Schmidt, *Die Zeit,* Oct. 30, 2008)

It should be well known that the representatives of the United States hegemony, acting as the world police, take a different view

in this regard. It is no coincidence that America is constantly waging war in the Middle East, seizing the world's natural resources and replacing South American governments at will if the feudalists in Washington do not like them.

In this context, it is hardly surprising that the United States is also conducting biological weapons research on the Russian border. The United States is said to maintain over 300 such facilities worldwide. Against this background, the fact that the US military is actively trying to develop biological weapons that can combat individual ethnic groups through their specific genetic characteristics seems particularly worrying. Corresponding research projects have been part of DARPA's portfolio for a long time.

Given such circumstances, Russia's military operation appears in a different light than under the premise that Putin simply wants to expand his sphere of influence in the region. If this were his top priority, he would have had to act two decades ago, when NATO's provocative eastward expansion was gaining momentum.

A comparison of the geopolitical maps of 1999 and 2020 speaks for itself. Putin could have intervened as early as last September, when joint NATO and Ukraine maneuvers were held on the Russian border, which included an attack on the powerful neighbor. The real motives for Putin's current actions remain obscure.

How US hegemony sees NATO's geopolitical role is shown by the military alliance's announcement that it will hold the next joint maneuver with Ukraine as early as this year—"NATO Defender Europe 2022." The words of Victoria Nuland, who recently gained dubious fame from a leaked phone call from 2013 or 2014, are also telling. She was Deputy Secretary of State of the United States at the time and negotiated the structure of the Ukrainian government

following the so-called Euromaidan, the preparations for which were largely financed by the United States, its NGOs and oligarchs such as George Soros.

In response to her interlocutor's questions about potential objections from the European Union to Ukraine's planned course of action and future political leaders, Nuland replied dryly:

"*Fuck the EU!*"

It is noteworthy that it was also Victoria Nuland who publicly declared in 2013 that the United States had spent almost five billion US dollars on "strengthening democracy" in Ukraine after the collapse of the Soviet Union. Even *ZEIT Online* asked in an article from May 17, 2015:

"*Five billion to buy a whole revolution?*"

Nuland herself was on the ground in Kyiv in 2014, distributing cookies around the city and working closely with the network of corrupt US protégés that now rules the country. It was also Nuland who, on March 8, 2022, confirmed the alleged conspiracy theory that the US was operating biological laboratories in Ukraine before a committee of the US Senate. Based on the activities of the United States in Ukraine over the past twenty years, it can be stated with near certainty that the country is currently under the thumb of American military hegemony and that the provocation at Russia's border mark is geopolitically deliberate. How exactly Vladimir Putin's role is to be classified in this can hardly be seriously assessed.

He could be acting in collusion with his former friends from the WEF, namely by provoking a conflict between Russia, NATO

and China, which would then serve to implement an Orwellian scenario of equally strong power blocs. But he could also have made a serious break with the West and now primarily want to defend Russia's autonomy.

In the recent past, Putin has often articulated dissent with the strategic plans of the technocrats from Davos and got upset about the social decay of traditional values—he apparently didn't really warm up to wokeness.

Perhaps Russia really does feel threatened by the West, the United States, or the North Atlantic military alliance, which promised as recently as 1990 and under US Secretary of State James Baker that NATO would not move *"one inch eastward."* The same was said in 1991 by German diplomat Jürgen Chrobog, who assured Russia that NATO had no plans to expand beyond the Elbe.

In principle, the same applies to China. Like Russia, the Asian superpower only achieved its current dominance on the geopolitical Monopoly board thanks to massive support from Anglo-American financial tycoons. At the beginning of 2022, I discussed the historical background in this regard in two separate texts on Russia and the Middle Kingdom.

From this point of view, it seems illogical that the historically closely linked power blocs—United States, China and Russia—would actually start a hot war or even nuclear conflict. To this day, cooperation on both an economic and financial level is too close. The corporations, governments, intelligence agencies (of which the United States maintains more than twenty) and diplomatic circles of the superpowers are well connected, even if the media often paint a different picture of the geopolitical situation, in order to justify sanctions, military interventions,

tariffs or embargoes. After all, the three superpowers serve the same idols: corporatism and technocracy. And as a form of society, they have no political ideology. The only goal of these structures of domination is control. This has now reached totalitarian proportions and culminates in the biosecurity doctrine that is gaining ground everywhere.

De facto supranational organizations such as the International Monetary Fund, the United Nations and the WHO already determine the course of the world. An example of this is the World Health Organization's new pandemic treaty, which undermines national constitutions in the event of a disaster. In addition to the institutions that are in the public eye, however, there is a large number of committees that completely elude democratic processes yet exert enormous influence on international politics and the development of civil society.

Among these are, aside from the already mentioned WEF: the Bilderberg Meetings, Bohemian Grove, Munich Security Conference, the Net Zero Asset Managers Initiative, the Trilateral Commission as well as the Inter-Parliamentary Union. The latter, founded in 1889 and based in Geneva, is an association of almost all parliaments which, although hardly known to the public, determines the future of humanity in the ivory tower of power and has had a cooperation agreement with the United Nations since 1996. In addition there are the thousands and thousands of NGOs, foundations, trusts, funds, think tanks, clubs and asset management companies that influence the course of events in the background.

"Bipartisan usually means that a greater deception than usual is being carried out." (George Carlin, American comedian)

Thus, although the modern feudal system is on the verge of fulfilling its wildest dreams even without a hot war in continental Europe, various circumstances give every reason to believe that an escalating military conflict would play into the hands of the plans of the imperialist caste.

First and foremost, there is the fact that the planned introduction of a new monetary system would be much easier after the turmoil of a veritable war. The last two major changes in the international financial system had only been made possible by the preceding world war.

Furthermore, it is important to remember that the concept of "creative destruction" postulated by Klaus Schwab is to be understood quite literally—this is proven by the fatal consequences of the deliberately destructive Covid crisis management and the tacit acceptance of it by the ruling class, which does not give a damn about the sensitivities of the people at the bottom of the food chain.

Thus, civil wars, military conflicts of individual states or even a world war seem to be understood in certain circles as a legitimate lever for changing global conditions.

History also sadly proves that wars are not only a lucrative business for the international elites but simply a geopolitical necessity when seeking to rearrange the world map at regular intervals and consolidating or shifting the spheres of influence of power blocs. The prime example of this circumstance is the Second World War, the outcome of which was only made possible by the unipolar world order that existed from 1945 to 2022.

At least in theory. The fact that this is now to be replaced by a multipolar world order by hook or by crook does not necessarily bode well in this context.

The fact that a considerable part of the ruling oligarchy demonstrably identifies with the ideas and concepts of eugenics, which has been experiencing an inglorious revival in the form of bioethics since the beginning of the Covid crisis, also gives little hope for a sensible handling of the crisis. And the majority of conservationists are also of the opinion that the planet suffers from massive overpopulation. Conclusion: Depopulation is desirable in many milieus. Following this logic, 60 to 80 million deaths, as after the Second World War, would be a godsend for the hubris of the amoral neo-feudalists and the fear-blinded teenagers of the "Last Generation."

"The most unjust peace is still better than the most just war." (Marcus Tullius Cicero)

Further indications that at least a territorially limited war between Russia and NATO could be imminent are the increasing weapon deliveries from NATO countries to Ukraine and far-reaching financial commitments by the United States to the Zelenskyy government. The examination of a hastily submitted, urgent application by Ukraine for admission to the EU is also more than an affront to Russia and the opposite of a de-escalation policy, even if the application was rejected for the time being. Thus, at least for the time being, the Polish fighter jets that had been demanded in Ukraine will not be delivered. However, the fact that even Germany is already indirectly affected by war preparations in the East is suggested by the recent shutdown of all highway cameras, which have served to monitor the nation's main traffic arteries. If these are taken off the grid across the board, this could

indicate the relocation of military equipment from or through Germany towards Ukraine.

In any case, political capital is already being made from the Ukraine crisis. In the Free State of Bavaria, the state of emergency declared due to Covid was officially extended on March 9, 2022, as announced by the Ministry of the Interior.

The purported reason was the Ukraine crisis. The permanent state of emergency is the model under which politics will be made in the future, be it regionally or internationally. Thus, in a pitifully obvious way, the ruling system is trying to maintain the appearance of democracy while taking on increasingly totalitarian features. Otherwise, the technocratic-fascist course could hardly be enforced against the population.

In any case, it is striking that the NATO countries in particular are making every effort to keep the conflict in Ukraine going or even intensify it. Normally, if you want peace, you send diplomats, and if you want war, you supply weapons. Ultimately, it can be assumed that the Ukraine crisis will continue to occupy people in Europe for a long time to come. Unfortunately, war, chaos, fear and destruction benefit those elitist imperialist interest groups that are trying to turn the world upside down according to their sick ideas by means of the Great Reset and the Great Narrative. The extent to which this conflict will develop into a cold or hot war will probably depend on how well the current narrative of the Russian invasion catches in the coming weeks.

If the current, empty and misinformation-steeped reporting of *BILD* and other media outlets continues, we would have to unfortunately assume that we are not facing an economic war

but possibly a tangible, military confrontation. Otherwise, the permanent state of emergency can hardly be maintained.

This confrontation can be limited to the states bordering Russia and the use of conventional weapons—but in the worst-case scenario, it can also lead to a conflagration, world war or nuclear war. What is clear is that in the past, the relevant interest groups were willing to use any means to achieve their inhumane goals.

However, the likelihood of a devastating world war, which, as I can personally confirm, has been the subject of much discussion on British television in recent weeks, seems rather low, primarily for one reason: such a scenario would severely damage the digital control infrastructure that international corporatism has installed in recent years. And since this forms the core of the technocratic future, which corresponding circles imagine as an ideal, it seems nonsensical to throw the billions invested in it to the wind and to set back the corresponding development by years by bombing away entire regions.

Yes, Putin is certainly a megalomaniac, narcissistic and unscrupulous man of power. But this statement also applies to almost every other head of state, president, minister and big capitalist who goes to great lengths for the success of his own agenda.

Yes, the Russian invasion of Ukraine is a violation of international law and must be condemned in the strongest possible terms. However, this applies equally to the covert influence on governments around the world pursued by US hegemony as well as to NATO's creeping eastward expansion, which created today's status quo in the first place. Not to mention the numerous wars that the US military has been waging for decades to guarantee the dominance of US hegemony and to absorb natural resources.

Military conflicts, for as long as they have existed, have served only a small group: the ruling class. Never the population. In the past, it was kings, princes and popes who struggled for regional power. Today, it is the super-rich, the tech giants, the financial moguls of wealth consulting, the corporations and ice-cold geo-strategists of hegemony who see the entire planet as a kind of Monopoly game. It is not always clear who is playing against whom. But the goals are known, documented and the corresponding information is usually freely available.

The unscrupulousness with which these goals are pursued knows no bounds. This is shown by the first two world wars. The population degenerates into cannon fodder in war. In battle, the human being becomes an anonymous number in the system. To a number on strategy maps and a blank white cross in a military cemetery. Anyone who has ever been to Verdun can understand the oppressive feeling at the sight of such a place. Therefore, any war is wrong. Because weapons don't bring peace. Only suffering.

"The great Carthage fought three wars. After the first one, it was still powerful. After the second, it was still habitable. After the third, it was nowhere to be found."
(Berthold Brecht)

Destination Technocracy

While three dominant horror scenarios keep the population in suspense, politicians do not seem to care much about the actual elimination of these problems. While supposed "Freedom Days" are celebrated and heroes of Ukraine are applauded, the introduction of a mandatory digital identity is primarily at the center of all state action.

The manifold crises of our time and the increasing reliance on screens are absorbing the attention and emotions of the people of the post-truth era. A persistent, often confusing flood of information creates uncertainty and weakens our sense of orientation. Perspectives become a mirage. Convictions and what is believed to be secure are called into question anew every day. Existential fears are widespread in view of current developments.

Many people have been under constant stress for two years anyway. The battery is empty. The desperate attempt to save the ideal world of one's own life from the most significant paradigm shifts of the past seventy years uses up reserves. According to the WHO, depression and anxiety have increased by a staggering 25 percent worldwide. Covid policy has done a great job in this regard.

The world is changing. And rapidly. Just not for the better. By now, everyone in their social, cultural and economic environment is probably noticing this. Nothing is the same as it was before the

supposed pandemic. The state of emergency has become the norm. Germany's number one panic preacher, Federal Minister of Health Karl Lauterbach, now even unabashedly confirms this at prime time.

And even though the Covid crisis is currently (temporarily) subsiding—depending on which country you are in—at least two other fear narratives dominate people's everyday lives: the chaos in Ukraine and the climate crisis. In addition, there is now a famine predicted for the near future and the potential Third World War.

Putin is also to blame for the massive increase in gasoline prices. Although most of the money you leave at the pump goes to the state as taxes, and for once you can't blame the oil companies for price gouging. Nevertheless, in the opinion of Greenpeace or the Greens, there is now an urgent need for speed limits, car-free Sundays, tofu and cold apartments against Russian aggression. Galloping inflation, the deepening economic crisis and food supply bottlenecks are also being blamed on the war in Ukraine in the blink of an eye—even though the situation there really escalated just a few days ago.

Two years of deliberately destructive crisis management are not the main reason for the economic decline, according to officials. The fact that more than 14,000 people have died in the Donbas since 2014 because the corrupt, US-appointed government of Ukraine is carrying out a veritable genocide of the ethnic Russian population there, and that the war has therefore actually been going on for eight years, does not play a role in the current considerations of the German government. It's the Russians. There is no grey area. No matter which crisis is the dominant one at the moment, the solutions that are presented to the population as

having no alternative, are always the same in a modified form: more government, more regulation, more biometrics and digitalization. Conversely, there is less personal and economic autonomy, fewer local and decentralized forms of life and economy, less freedom, individual mobility and fundamental rights.

> **"Before leaders of the masses seize power to adapt reality to their lies, their propaganda is characterized by their extreme contempt for the facts as such." (Hannah Arendt)**

This tendency becomes most evident when looking at the development of the topic of "digital identity," which experienced a remarkable boom due to the Covid crisis. According to the government-affiliated experts, a pandemic can only be brought under control by implementing digital vaccination passports and contact tracing processes worldwide, which would have been an unthinkable invasion of privacy and a blatant violation of the personal right to data protection even before Covid.

The fact that such barriers have long since been torn down after two years of information warfare is underlined by the announcement of the browser and search engine provider DuckDuckGo, which had, until then, advertised with attributes such as data protection, privacy, independence or anonymity. Now the company is announcing that from now on, "misinformation" about the Ukraine crisis will be censored in search results. The question is who decides what is classified as right or wrong. In any case, DuckDuckGo is no longer suitable for well-founded research with balanced search results.

A decentralized and truly independent alternative exists under the name of Presearch. A project without financial dependencies on Big Tech or corporate oligarchy. The whitepaper

is openly accessible and a recent interview with the founder provides extensive background information. The associated smartphone browser runs smoothly. And Presearch's search results on the desktop computer or laptop are different from popular search engines like night and day. Much of what is censored elsewhere can be found in www.presearch.org. There is also Archive.org, a digital time machine that stores web pages and their content over the years and thus makes deleted data still accessible.

A glance at the financiers of the supposedly independent provider DuckDuckGo shows that this company, which has long been regarded by many as a guarantor of security on the internet, also wields the great capital of corporatism—because the millions that DuckDuckGo has at its disposal come primarily from Union Square Ventures (USV), one of the largest capital raising centers in the United States, as well as from Omers, the Canadian Pension Fund. These monetary dependencies do not necessarily speak of uninfluenced entrepreneurship in favor of internet users but of dangerous proximity to the so-called establishment.

"The technical state, without being anti-democratic, deprives democracy of its substance." (Helmut Schelsky)

The situation is similar regarding to digital vaccination passports. Whether ID Austria, Swiss eID, German eID card, eIDAS of the EU, CIE in Italy, Biometric Electronic Residence Card in France, Digital ID in England or Digital ID in the United States—the introduction of such an ID card in the wake of the Covid crisis seems to have been a higher priority for these countries than improving or modernizing their ailing health systems. The latter have not enjoyed investments in the order of billions of euros, unlike the state's biometric control infrastructure.

The fact that Ukraine also recently announced that it wants to expand its Dia app and combine the digital ID with the vaccination passport and a universal basic income to form the first social credit system on the European continent, even though the country is officially at war, should also give pause for thought.

After all, the strategic prioritization of such projects gives clear indications of the overarching goals pursued by the digital-financial complex when it cynically calls crises such as war or a pandemic an opportunity.

The fact that the totalitarian measures during the alleged epidemic of the century were always about obedience could have been recognized early on, despite pretended justifications from official bodies. It is not only the ungrounded lockdowns and the fanatical obligation to wear masks that are symbolic acts and psychological tools to bring the population into line.

It is, above all, the permanent monitoring of all contact and movement data of people as well as automated access control to all areas of everyday life that is at the heart of the state strategy. Because this is the holy grail of totalitarian corporatism: absolute, digital control over the individual, his thoughts, actions and financial transactions. And it is the companion that people are constantly carrying in their pockets at all times, Apple, Google, Huawei or Samsung, that make this possible, in addition, of course, to people's ignorance of dealing with the pocket spy. Ministries, corporations, foundations and asset managers have spent tens of billions since March 2020 to install the appropriate infrastructure in public spaces, in keeping with the Chinese model. According to *Homeland Security Today*, FRAPORT, the operating company of Frankfurt Airport, has ordered 87 biometric check-in machines from the United States company SITA, comprising the largest order in Europe.

In 2021, the police in New York began using robot dogs from Boston Dynamics to monitor the city center on a trial basis, and in Singapore they are already active in regular operation and monitor compliance with Covid measures with cameras. By the way, the robot manufacturer is a spin-off of MIT (Massachusetts Institute of Technology) and is financed in the form of a holding company by Alphabet Inc. (Google), Hyundai Motor Group and SoftBank Group.

It seems certain that other models from the United States company will soon appear on the streets of international metropolises. A strangely morbid video by Boston Dynamics shows how far the motor and sensory abilities of the machines have already advanced. However, the military developments are likely to be a good step farther than is publicly communicated. RoboCop sends its regards.

Surrounded by a digital network of invisible surveillance and superior machines, the smartphone marks the link between humans and the Internet-of-Things; or Internet-of-Bodies, as the self-proclaimed do-gooders of the World Economic Forum call it. The QR code, as a precursor to the implanted chip, will be necessary in the future in order to be able to participate in social life. In Switzerland, for example, invoices can only be issued and paid with a QR code from October 2022. The paper transfer forms, which have been tried and tested over decades, are history.

As soon as the reserve currencies are fully digitized after the introduction of central bank digital currencies, the respective state will have de facto absolute control over each individual citizen and his or her radius of movement. This has been impressively demonstrated by the Canadian government's handling of the truckers protesting in Ottawa, who were unceremoniously

blocked from accessing their own account balances and credit cards by emergency decree.

> **"Once upon a time, people transferred their thinking to machines in the hope that they would become free. But that only allowed other people with machines to enslave them." (Frank Herbert)**

Anyone who donates to protests, visits the wrong websites, uses too much CO_2 or cannot prove that they have been injected will no longer have access to their money with just one click. Perhaps the supermarket door equipped with sensors no longer opens because the smartphone has already reported the corresponding mobility status to all surrounding Wi-Fi networks minutes in advance. The Tesla may also be automatically informed that you have to stay at home today due to certain indicators—and simply won't start. Brave new world 2030.

The long-term consequences of mandatory, digital linking of biometric and financial information for all citizens are dystopian. In the future, every movement, every transaction, every communication will be transparent, can be analyzed in real time and can be manipulated, at least indirectly. That is why the EU is working feverishly to weaken data protection and wants to use legislative means to enable access to any form of private communication. Mail, chat, SMS, phone call, browser history, mobile phone transaction data. Everything. Abuse is inevitable. But that is exactly what the future is, as a look at the past proves. For the visible signs of the new totalitarianism, such as biometric airport terminals, are only the superficial symptom of a broader agenda for automated control of human civilization by a technocratic caste. For at least a decade, it has been working on the

innovations that will be touted as a technological revolution to the average person in 2022.

In particular, efforts to create a digital identity—or more precisely, the supposed fundamental right to a digital identity of every inhabitant of the world—have long been high on the list of priorities of supranational institutions such as the UN. For this reason, the project is also part of the 17 goals of the United Nations' 2030 Agenda. Targets 16.4 and 16.9 in particular should raise eyebrows after clicking on "Indicators." This is because if you look closely, it is about global control of financial flows and the mandatory digital identity for every person from the moment of birth. That doesn't sound like all countries working together for fundamental rights or a better world. It sounds like the pursuit of absolute control over a herd of livestock.

"The UN is only good as an instrument of American policy." (Peter Scholl-Latour)

Even more disturbing are projects such as the Smart Dust, which allows nanoparticles to be spread into the air on a large scale, or the QR vaccination patch, to be rolled out in the near future. However, digital identity is at the heart of all control efforts, as Ursula von der Leyen explained on the DigitalEU YouTube channel back in June 2021.

Australia has also been working on the issue since at least 2017, according to a marketing video from the Australian government. And in February 2022, the Canadian Bankers Association once again made a strong case for the introduction of the "digital collar."

At the center of the development of a global digital identity is ID2020, a supposedly non-profit organization founded in 2017

and whose main partners are companies such as Microsoft, the Rockefeller Foundation, Microsoft, GAVI or Accenture. These are old acquaintances when it comes to controversial projects, corruption, corporatism and eugenics. What is particularly interesting about ID2020 is how the WEF-affiliated boss—Dakota Gruener—tries to philosophically portray the introduction of a digital identity. Because she makes every effort to market the totalitarian request as an elementary fundamental human right by engaging in semantic reinterpretation and abusing the poorest of this world as a cheap line of argumentation, as a TEDx talk from July 2019 emphasizes.

> **"If you don't have a seat at the table, you're probably on the menu." (Elizabeth Warren)**

The World Economic Forum (WEF) already provided similar justifications for digital IDs in November 2020. And a new 46-page paper by the WEF called "Advancing Digital Agency," published in February 2022, also describes in detail how the interaction, or fusion, of man and machine on the part of the ruling class is envisioned in the future. In a nutshell: Humans have little to say about it.

Virtually all personal data—and in the future this will simply mean all data generated by a person—is directly or indirectly accessible to government agencies. Even if superficially a sham debate about data protection is being conducted. The more data streams are consolidated and centralized, the easier it is to misuse them. In addition, in the near future, data will no longer be limited to the "waste products" of human activity, such as people's browser history, which can be used by corporations for targeted advertising, but can instead be controlled in real time to control the population. In the boardrooms, this is referred to as micro-management. This is already in practice in China today.

The projects described above also cast the new global pandemic treaty of the WHO in a different light. This is because such a set of rules would completely override national regulations, including data protection, in the event of a pandemic. The WHO would have absolute authority over the measures to be taken in each member state that has signed the agreement. This can certainly be interpreted as the constitution of a democratically illegitimate world government.

What exactly these health protection measures could look like in the near future is described in a document from UNICEF—ostensibly a child protection organization—which proposes, among other things, the use of intelligent drones to spray vulnerable areas with disinfectant (or smart dust) as well as the monitoring of city centers by the self-sufficient aircraft. Sounds more like a military or intelligence strategy than the protection of children. Undoubtedly, such documents of the supranational oligarchy prove that national Covid measures are simply no longer necessary at the moment. This is because global governance is now logistically able to centrally direct the canon of oppression at the earliest opportunity for all member states of the United Nations and the WHO. The scaling back of the measures in many countries must therefore be seen as a farce and as a sedative for the angry masses.

This probably also explains the fact that many countries have refrained from forcibly enforcing their respective Covid certificates, vaccination passports and test certificates in recent weeks and are currently noticeably scaling back restrictions. This is because the hardware for total digital surveillance has been installed over the past 24 months and can be reactivated at lightning speed and adapted to the WHO's "Immunity Passport." In addition, protests against totalitarian policies increased massively worldwide. The system was in danger of being completely exposed. And resistance makes change more expensive.

"A basic principle of modern state capitalism is that costs and risks are socialized as much as possible, while profit is privatized." (Noam Chomsky)

Thus, the Ukraine crisis came at an incredibly opportune time for the system. Germany, in particular, has become a social powder keg, namely because the government remains undeterred in its authoritarian Covid course. In the Federal Republic of Germany, the concept of freedom is now defined by the so-called 3G rule. So far, the 2G rule has prevailed for practically all areas of life. If you don't classify that as fascist, you don't know what fascism means. Germany has mutated into a Potemkin village of democracy. But the façade is visibly crumbling. And that's an opportunity for the average person. Because it was only through (or with) Covid that many people began to realize by whom they are being governed.

The totalitarian dropped its mask more than once during the supposed pandemic. The bio-fascism of the Fourth Industrial Revolution broke through openly. On the street, as well as on the internet. After two years of "fear porn," the population is traumatized and divided—the caesura is in place—but such criminal action on the part of those in power cannot be explained in the long run, even to the most compliant German citizen.

Even in the narrowest space of debate, political decisions eventually arrive in the reality of people's lives. Even if it increasingly resembles a "Truman Show." In view of the ignorant actions in Berlin and at the Federal Constitutional Court in Karlsruhe, the question must now be allowed whether the provocation of a genuine civil war in the land of judges and executioners is intentional. There is no other way to explain the inhumane policy of the German government.

In 2017, one could even read in an article in the now tame *taz* that "the digital revolution and neoliberalism are merging." The promises of freedom of the internet are dead.

The *taz* author Kai Schlieter wrote, at the time:

The *New York Times recently reported on Facebook's new "censorship tool" designed for the Chinese market. It allows the government to remove topics from the news feed. And thus, out of people's minds. It wasn't long ago that Facebook was considered a "social" network, a synonym for freedom of expression, even freedom itself. But fewer and fewer people believe in this. The internet was also sold as a symbol of grassroots democracy. Even critical nerds are hypnotized by this phantasm of freedom to this day, even though it is not tenable in terms of content.*
The internet and computer culture grew out of the same root that still shapes them today: an academic-military tribe and a branch that grew out of it for the development of corresponding business models. In this way, after the horrors of the Second World War, the military and economic supremacy of the West was to be secured. Hidden by grassroots folklore, however, today's oligopolies of Silicon Valley emerged. Indeed, they are so super-powerful that they see themselves as rulers of the new world order and compete with the political. The continent of Facebook is already home to 1.9 billion inhabitants. But Mark Zuckerberg won't let himself be elected. He is the king."

Co-opted and sedated by the parallel world of the debate space censored by Facebook and their ilk, resistance to the government seems to be suffocating under the background noise of the pandemic. The stoic-seeming serenity with which the German population accepts the increasingly encroaching state system or absolutely grotesque Bundestag debates on compulsory vaccination is astonishing from the outside.

On the other hand, it must be noted that transparent foreign reporting in the leading German media has long since ceased to exist. This makes it increasingly difficult to compare one's position in one's own country with the outside world. In Germany, there was no detailed coverage of large demonstrations by opponents of the measures in France, nor of the referendum on the Covid law in Switzerland in November last year. You don't see pictures of the mass protests against the vaccination passport in Italy or crowds of people taking to the streets in Austria against compulsory vaccination.

When people no longer have the resources to form their own opinions, they perceive as reality what they see and hear. That's why propaganda thrives on constant repetition. On the unity of opinion and the illusory world of collectivism.

In addition to the daily censorship of the Silicon Valley platform economy, the totalitarian testing ground of China once again shows how advanced the creation of a fictitious reality is, where a virtual TV presenter is already being presented who looks deceptively real. It is clear that anything the system wants to communicate can be put into their mouths. So-called deep fakes can no longer be distinguished from real people.

And as a presentation by Google from 2018 shows, the in-house AI (Artificial Intelligence) was already able to make phone calls on behalf of the owner on its own. For example, to make an appointment for a hairdresser—without the person being called noticing the difference between man and machine, mind you. Determining what is real now seems almost impossible. By excluding obvious propaganda and narrative narratives, it is only possible to narrow down the extremes between which the truth is hidden.

"Television is the greatest cultural catastrophe that the Earth has experienced in the time we can remember." (Joseph Weizenbaum)

An artificial media reality curated by the state in combination with nationwide artificial intelligence and a fully integrated digital identity, limited individual mobility as well as central bank digital currencies, form the almost insurmountable, golden cage of the next generations.

Thus, after the current withdrawal of Covid restrictions in many countries, it is fatal to assume that the fight against modern totalitarianism is over. Quite the opposite. It has only just begun. Covid was only the warm-up for a post-libertarian form of society. The measures to contain the supposed pandemic are the exoskeleton of a technocratic system whose core is digital identity.

For this reason, it is wrong to let the peaceful protest against the now openly fascist system rest after the (partial, temporary) subsidence of the state encroachments. In Germany in particular, it would be appropriate to call a general strike.

Nevertheless, at the slightest moment of relief, many people behave like animals that have been found, imprisoned and nursed back to health after being injured by humans—and then released back into the wild: as soon as the cage door is open, they run off as if stung by a tarantula, without ever looking back.

The world's geopolitical, financial, biological and socio-structural processes are heading toward one thing: the establishment of the mature surveillance state, via a mandatory introduction of digital proof of identity. It is therefore important to prevent its widespread introduction at all costs. After all, once an ID system

with social credit functions is installed, it will be almost impossible to protest or take action against it.

Canada has shown that. Therefore, the rapid dismantling of bureaucracy and centralism should be the primary goal of any opposition. The state must be scaled back to its core functions. If the red lines of a humanistic Enlightenment are not maintained now, there may not be any way to draw them soon.

"Racial segregation was legal. Slavery was legal. War is legal. Never use legality as a guideline for morality." (Unknown author)

March 20, 2022

Ukraine: False Friends – False Enemies

“We used to suffer from crime, now we suffer from laws.” (Tacitus)

First of all, *every* war is wrong. There are no grey areas. Guns do not bring peace. This text is therefore neither to be understood as approval of the actions of an insane Russian tsar and his Chinese allies—nor as a justification for the escalation policy of US hegemony, NATO and the EU. Because each of these systems now obviously stands for one and the same thing: tyranny.

The President of Ukraine, Volodymyr Zelensky, a former actor, comedian and member of the World Economic Forum, is being hailed by the Western powers as the new hero of democracy, who is daringly throwing himself against Vladimir Putin’s supposed campaign of annihilation. Even if it means banning the opposition and bringing the media into line.

Even the fact that Ukraine will be the first country on the European continent to introduce a social credit system based on the Chinese model, even though the country supposedly sees itself covered by the chaos of war, does not detract from the adulation for Zelensky. And why should it? Counterparts such as Canadian Prime

Minister Justin Trudeau have hardly concealed their enthusiasm for Xi Jinping's dictatorship and have long been campaigning for a rapprochement between the West and the totalitarian Chinese model of society.

Meanwhile, Germany's *ZDF* media outlet is desperately trying to gloss over this absolutely anti-democratic approach by arguing with the state of emergency. As if twenty years after 9/11 or, the latest Covid crisis, have not shown what this means.

Until recently, even leading media described Zelensky as a corrupt criminal with ties to right-wing groups. The name appeared in the scandalous Pandora Papers—and Ukraine was still considered the most corrupt country in Europe by the British *GUARDIAN* on February 6, 2015. During the same period, *TIME* magazine also reported on the alarming level of corruption in the battered state on Russia's doorstep. Unfortunately, the article in question has recently been hidden behind a paywall. Why?

On the other hand, *TIME* can come up with another telling text from January 7, 2021, which describes how Nazi groups from Ukraine recruit new members in the United States on Facebook—and how they are then lured to Ukraine to merge with the Azov Battalion.

In this context, it is also noteworthy that the president of Ukraine, who appears to be a hero of the working class, apparently owns a $35 million mansion in Miami in addition to a four-million-dollar mansion in Italy. The property comes from the dark circle of the Epstein network.

During his presidency, he is also said to have parked a fortune of over one billion US dollars at Dresdner Bank in Costa Rica,

according to a member of the opposition. Where it came from is largely unclear. However, the sum is not implausible when you consider that the CIA vehicle USAID alone pumped about five billion US dollars into the country from 1991 to 2014, as Victoria Nuland publicly admitted in 2013. And in 2021, USAID even transferred $155 million. Between 2014 and 2021, it was certainly not less. And this is just one of many state-instrumentalized NGOs that have provided funding for Ukraine over the past two decades. Even under Show President Trump, millions continued to flow into the country.

Fact-checkers have increasingly jumped to Zelensky's side in recent weeks and are trying to refute the rumors of an embezzled billion. Their main argument is that Dresdner Bank has no branches in Costa Rica. That's right. In 2009, the financial institution, formerly known as Dresdner Bank Lateinamerika AG, was largely absorbed into Commerzbank AG. Deutsche Bank bought the rest. So, Zelensky's money may no longer be deposited with Dresdner Bank, which has fallen into disrepute due to its early support for the German Nazi regime—but Commerzbank Costa Rica or Deutsche Bank on site have certainly been gladly taken over by well-heeled customers without much ado. Corruption also exists en masse in this Latin American country, as an article by the Washington-based Council on Hemispheric Affairs from 2004, or a more recent article by *Americas Quarterly* from August 2019 points out. It is not for nothing that the country is considered the Switzerland of the Western Hemisphere.

Since Zelensky appears several times in the Pandora Papers, the allegations do not seem to be entirely out of thin air. With an opaque network of holdings and investments, like the one operated by the Ukrainian president with the support of his friends from the banking paradise, large sums can be accumulated, managed and transferred anonymously relatively easily.

This may seem secondary to some in view of a hot war at the moment. Nevertheless, these circumstances do not give the impression that the EU and the North Atlantic military alliance are dealing with a selfless, people-oriented, flawless democrat—for whom they would still have to risk a nuclear war with Russia in the worst-case NATO alliance scenario.

This assumption is also contradicted by Zelensky's current announcement, according to which Ukraine has now banned eleven political parties, in other words the entire opposition, due to alleged ties to Russia.

In addition, all major media outlets in the country are now under rigid military censorship from Kiev. The public prosecutor's offices were also disempowered, by means of a declaration of martial law. Ukraine has long exhibited openly fascistic policies. For eight years, the corrupt regime, with the help of the West, has been oppressing (and attacking) 20 percent of its own population in Donbas. According to official figures, 14,000 deaths are recorded even on Wikipedia—before Russia's invasion, mind you. And the number of unreported cases is probably much higher.

So, who are the EU, NATO and the United States actually supporting? What is happening in Ukraine? How can it be that the West is defending a corrupt regime that was obviously financed by the US military and US intelligence services and that can be proven to have right-wing extremist views? Doesn't it bother anyone that the Klitschkos openly let themselves be photographed with the right-wing groups in their home country—when in the past a single AfD member at a Covid demo already triggered a media shitstorm?

What is the purpose of the nuclear saber-rattling of the opposing superpowers—when both the United States and Canada, as well as Russia and China, publish strikingly identical strategy papers that articulate a new, "rules-based" international order under the leadership of the UN and associated supranational organizations as a strategic goal, while the ostensibly ideologically hostile power blocs in Ukraine are belligerent?

Geopolitics and globalization go beyond the concept of the nation-state. A large part of state operations therefore serves other goals than are superficially communicated. We think only of Iraq.

At the time, the Bush administration launched this war of aggression, which violated international law, on the basis of demonstrably false evidence and coldly lied to the world's citizens in order to enforce Anglo-American economic and political interests in the Arab world. Similar things occurred in Syria, Yemen, Iran and many more countries. It is part and parcel of the Pax Americana.

In this geopolitical board game, the population is at best a disposable mass. All sides agitate, engage in propaganda and lie to justify their actions and to secure the hysterical applause of civil society.

The arrogance of the international rulers and string-pullers has now taken on such obscene forms that they unabashedly announce their long-term, inhumane, dystopian agenda. This is not a conspiracy theory—but verifiable, openly anti-democratic, criminally organized actions of a self-proclaimed ruling caste. Organized crime and institutional corruption. For personal gain and against their own population. And the agenda of the new, rules-based order has been, as the strategy papers mentioned at the beginning show—published once by the USA and Canada

on February 23, 2021 and by Russia and China, on February 4, 2022. Especially in the last paragraph, which is devoted to strengthening international organizations, the opponents are astonishingly unanimous.

"The death of a man is a tragedy. But the death of millions is only a statistic." (Josef Stalin)

Reading the two documents shows that the strategic goals of the seemingly hostile power blocs are practically congruent. Both support the UN's 2030 Agenda, with its ambiguous and questionable goals in detail (see targets 16.4, 16.9 and 16.a.).

By implementing them, both East and West are ultimately administratively subservient to the United Nations, which will ultimately exercise not only legislative but also judicial and military power at the global level. The carrier for the bitter pill of absolute concentration of power is the sustainability goals.

It is technically supported by the digital-financial complex, which will amplify the consolidation of markets via the rampant platform economy until the middle class has been replaced by a monopolistic corporate oligarchy. This process has been underway since the pandemic was declared.

The nation-state remains as a lifeless shell. And the citizen, supposedly the sovereign of a participatory democracy, is powerless, disenfranchised and exposed to—or subjected—constant digital control. This is because its possibilities of influencing the new system tend towards zero. In addition, the nation-state is losing its financial independence as its assets lose value due to galloping inflation, while central bank digital currencies intensify dependence on the system.

Is the Ukraine conflict just another means to an end? Might it merely be another propaganda narrative with little truthfulness, such as Covid-19 or the fight against terrorism, to be able to talk human civilization into the technocratic transformation agenda of international corporatism as the only way out of the global dilemma?

Or might it be Phase 2: War of the Great Reset, as the media outlet Winter Oak from England labeled it? This question should be asked by the blind and solidarity-based Western values soon if it does not want to meet its end as a cheap stirrup holder of Anglo-American hegemony in Ukraine. Or as a trigger and scene of an escalating military conflict in Europe, abused by the United States, China and Russia, a trio in strategic agreement that is now restructuring the world to its liking. Unconditional solidarity, proclaimed by the political and economic profiteers of the war, seems to blind us in this regard.

The sheer questioning of official reports is already considered blasphemy. This is massively reminiscent of the Covid crisis. Yet many today wish they had questioned the government's course earlier.

So, it is imperative, at least now, to take a closer look at what US hegemony, NATO, private security service providers and various NGOs have been doing in Ukraine for at least a decade—and what was the goal. I had already collected background information on this in my texts The Trojan Herd and The Roots of Hegemony. One thing quickly becomes clear from the open-ended analysis of the Ukraine crisis: it is by no means an organically grown conflict between two neighboring countries fighting over breakaway provinces.

The fact that a referendum in the disputed region in 2014 clearly declared the independence of the Donbas from Ukraine speaks against this. But this democratic process of the referendum was not recognized by the West and was dismissed as pro-Russian resistance.

Not only George Soros, his Open Society Foundations or the CIA-led NED (National Endowment for Democracy) have been active in Ukraine for more than a decade. Since the early 2000s, various parties have been trying to influence the situation in the country to their benefit. A broadcast manuscript of Südwestfunk (SWR2) dated November 8, 2017 entitled (translated) "The Power of George Soros—Regime Change in Ukraine and Georgia," which is intended for personal use but is now publicly accessible, proves that it has long been clear to the mainstream media that dubious things are going on in Ukraine.

Soros and the NED, by the way, were also active in Serbia in 1998, where they financed Otpor, an organization created with the aim of destabilizing the then ruling regime of Slobodan Milosevic. The US has experience in regime change. The process was repeated in Georgia and Ukraine, among other places.

> **"We should not underestimate the ability of well-run propaganda systems to drive people into irrational, murderous and suicidal behaviors." (Noam Chomsky)**

In an article published on July 9, 2018, the Israeli daily *Haaretz* describes how a group of human rights activists submitted a petition to the Supreme Court in Jerusalem calling on the government of Israel to stop arms shipments to Ukraine, arguing that the majority of them belong to Nazi groups within the Ukrainian military.

First and foremost, the Azov Battalion was secretly trained by the CIA, as Yahoo! News reports on March 16, 2022. Andy Corbley of World at Large also warned on March 4, 2022 against Western ignorance of the obviously right-wing radical system in Ukraine. And on March 19, 2018, even Reuters headlined a commentary with "Ukraine's neo-Nazi problem."

The Intercept reported on February 18, 2022, that a bill by US Senator Bon Menendez could not ensure into whose hands the US arms shipments to Ukraine ended up—and that there was a high probability that the recipients were neo-Nazis. Incidentally, the United States had already concluded a framework agreement with Ukraine in 2005 regarding future arms deliveries, as a corresponding state treaty on the servers of the US government clearly demonstrates.

It is therefore fitting that the training of the right-wing combat units in the country was also organized by the NATO countries themselves. Paid for by taxpayers' money.

Equally indicative of the actions of Anglo-American hegemony with regard to Ukraine is the fact that in December 2015—almost a year after the US-funded regime change in Ukraine—the US Congress, under pressure from the Pentagon, repealed a law prohibiting the financing of groups with a Nazi background, according to an article in *The Nation* on January 14, 2016.

Thus, it was still possible for the United States to legally send billions of dollars to the destructive forces on Russia's borders—even if their attitude embodies exactly what the United States, EU and NATO claim to be fighting: brown ideas.

Now one wonders whether all these problems of the new "partner state" of the EU and NATO have been solved in the meantime.

That this is not the case is implied by new findings about the co-operation of the Ukrainian Azov battalion with Nazi groups in the United States. The Azov Battalion and its partner organization, the Georgian Legion, have maintained active contacts with neo-Nazis in the United States for years and have helped to establish local offshoots of the right-wing extremist group in various European countries, including Germany and Italy.

These right-wing networks also have close ties to Moscow, where, according to *Newsweek*, even the chief racist of the Ku Klux Klan, David Duke, lived for several years. Indeed, he still owns an apartment there, which he likes to sublet to other US Nazi bigwigs who seem to be in town on a regular basis.

It is no longer a secret that the large, internationally active extremist organizations in particular were and are financed by the CIA and similar institutions.

The NSU (National Socialist Union) in Germany was also primarily a construct of the Office for the Protection of the Constitution and its ominous informants. However, the fact that these groups are systematically built up by the hegemony to later pursue imperialist interests with the created image of the enemy is apparently lost during the Ukraine crisis. Although the US did the same with Al-Qaeda and various other groups, no matter which political spectrum they belonged to. Washington is waging proxy wars by extremists on both the right and the left so as not to get its hands dirty. Wall Street is happy to fund both sides of the war.

For example, even the alleged storming of the US Capitol on January 6, 2021, which massively promoted the agenda of the military-industrial complex in the land of unlimited freedom,

can now be traced back to groups with close ties to the Azov battalion—and thus to the CIA.

The entire development in Ukraine since 2014 is reminiscent of US policy in the Middle East, where Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden were initially close partners of Washington and were lavishly supported. Until US hegemony needed them as an enemy and eliminated them. Ukraine is becoming the new Syria.

> **"In the long run, propaganda can undermine and pervert democratic processes. Genuine democracy and propaganda are fundamentally incompatible." (Ulrich Teusch)**

War is always a good business. This is shown by the current commitments of US security service providers in Ukraine.

Instead of officially participating in the war, the US government and NATO are happy to let private security companies do the dirty work on the ground. On March 9, 2022, the BBC published a corresponding article describing how private mercenaries are hired for crisis operations. They have gained experience in places such as Papua New Guinea, Angola or Sierra Leone—places that everyone associates with gruesome images of inhuman arbitrariness of war.

According to the government in Kiev, 16,000 contract soldiers are already on the move in the country to support the Ukrainian military, in other words the right-wing extremist Azov Battalion, as reported by the *Military Times.*

In addition to US veterans, highly-paid professional killers from companies such as Blackwater, aptly described as a "collection of dubious characters" in an article in *Die Zeit* on October 23, 2014, or DynCorp are now fighting for Zelensky and his like.

Such a contract killer earns about 10,000 US dollars per month in the name of the state. If he is not used as cannon fodder.

On March 5, 2022, the *Muslim Mirror* eloquently described Blackwater as "NATO's secret weapon in Ukraine." Further analyses of the covert involvement of the United States in Ukraine and the cooperation of Nazis in both countries are offered by journalist Ryan Cristian in his show The Daily Wrap-up from March 19, 2022 and March 23, 2022.

The company DynCorp was founded back in 1946, but in 2020 it was absorbed into the United States military service conglomerate Amentum due to various scandals and controversies. The name DynCorp was put on hold for marketing reasons—but otherwise everything remained the same, including the controversial corporate practices.

According to Human Rights Watch, for example, DynCorp was involved in human trafficking in Bosnia and sold underage children for sexual abuse to liquid buyers.

These, then, are the new, heroic partners of the Western values, for whom Berlin, Brussels and Washington want to unleash World War III if necessary: a corrupt, openly racist government in Kiev, right-wing extremist militias that control significant parts of the Ukrainian armed forces and administration, CIA-funded subversives and neo-Nazi networks, as well as contract killers of controversial US military contractors who operate covertly on behalf of NATO.

And this in a war in which the opposing parties are publishing identical strategy papers behind the scenes, which speak in favor of a new international order under the leadership of the UN. On

the face of it, there is little that fits together. However, if you pursue the long-term goal of governing by permanent emergency decree and instrumentalizing the three geopolitical blocs for feudalistic-looking power politics in order to impose a dystopian future on the people, you are exactly on the right track. Because fear makes people malleable.

"The enemy is within our walls. We must fight against our own luxury, our own stupidity and our own criminality." (Marcus Tullius Cicero)

Nothing Is Impossible

“One should not want to foresee the future but make it possible.” (Antoine de Saint-Exupéry)

You get people out of the system—but the system doesn’t get out of people.

This applies not only to the mafia, sects or lodges but also to the state system. Although the consequences of the sacrilege of leaving the Mafia are as well-known as they are fatal, one is ultimately free to decide. If impelled, a mafioso can renounce the blood oath and turn against the family, at his own risk.

In the case of sects or lodges, on the other hand, external intervention is often required to lure someone out of the spell of the conspiratorial community. This is because the member is usually not aware of his dependence and therefore does not feel an intrinsic impulse that motivates him to leave the comfort of the group. It takes an exit counsellor—sometimes even a veritable kidnapping, a cold withdrawal from the collectivist mantra—to make it clear to the brainwashed person after extraction, at least retrospectively, what damage he has done to himself with his unconditional loyalty to the guru.

This applies in strikingly similar form to the state system. Because even in this context, the majority of “addicts” are simply not aware of destructive dependence. And if such an awareness

does set in, the question still remains: Where should a potential exit lead? While the mafia offers obvious options such as going into hiding with a new identity, defecting to an opposing clan or being accepted into a witness protection program, the citizen motivated to leave the state system simply lacks alternatives at first glance. Because emigrating is not an exit.

Even as an exile, you will live in a state. The latter may appear to be less intrusive, offer less bureaucracy, better weather, a more diverse topography or a lower tax burden, but basic organizational structures are identical.

Anyone who has an ID card and pays taxes is a number in the system. Some 193 countries are currently organized in the United Nations or recognized by it. In addition, there is Vatican City and twelve other countries, nations or territories that are not members of the UN.

With this summary, the habitable part of the planet is administratively mapped and there is little room for anarchic forms of organization. Yet states are nothing more than fictitious entities. They are areas that were separated by colorful lines on maps and legitimized in one way or another by elitist power structures, mostly without the intervention of the average citizen. Overall, they are ruled by a caste of corrupt monarchs, military officers, clerics, oligarchs and populists, whose singular goal is to maintain power through a monopoly on the use of force.

In this way, states create legislation, wage wars, make money and literally keep their citizens, in modern democracies more aptly described as voting cattle or gossip cattle, in check.

When the state itself does not exercise or can directly exercise control, the digital economy steps in. And this is increasingly the case. After all, the concept of the nation-state has long since become obsolete thanks to the platform economy and supranational organizations, even if the misinformed population has not yet grasped that in its full scope. Thus, the question of how the freedom-loving, autonomous human being can escape the constraints of an omnipresent system when it can no longer be escaped by simply crossing a national border is more urgent.

Paradise no longer simply lurks behind a wall in the West or on another continent. After all, even if states continue to pursue national interests, governments vie for a prominent place at the table of global governance, or national pride and local color do somewhat shape life in different countries—all 193 states of the world pursue one overarching goal: technocracy.

In view of this fact, the desire for freedom and activism seem to challenge each other fruitlessly when the Covid opposition tries to put a stop to global digital totalitarianism by means of representative democracy at the national level. No parliament, no party and no citizens' movement will fundamentally change the system of the state with the legal, organizational or communicative means it provides. If elections could do that, they would be forbidden.

You can't change the system on your own playing field and according to your own defined rules. You have to leave the playing field of dysfunctional fake democracy in order to win.

Theoretically, this sounds powerful and promising. Constricted by a straitjacket of obligations and liabilities, however, many people who want to leave lack the vision for practical implementation.

Just like the conformists, who believe all information from the state and its henchmen without reflection, they expect external leadership to achieve more autonomy.

This primarily requires personal initiative. And at all levels. On the one hand, it is important to disentangle oneself mentally and emotionally from the pull of negative and meaningless external influences. This is the only way to have cognitive capacity and sufficient energy to create an individually fulfilling life plan outside of traditional systems.

On the other hand, the development of alternative social and economic structures must be promoted that reduce the increasing dependence of the citizen on the state system. Again, this sounds simple and plausible in theory. Nevertheless, most critics of the system are sorely lacking in concrete approaches to action. They point out mistakes, point out problems and criticize injustices. Without realizing that they themselves carry the Gordian knot in their heads, which has to be cut. How to increase the level of digital self-determination, how to counter economic injustice or how to rethink the socio-political construct is something I have already tried to outline in several texts.

More importantly, however, is currently the personal situation of the individual, who sees himself frightened by a permanent state of emergency. Such individuals form both a prerequisite for the realization of such concepts and solutions and a recipe for the success of new ideas. Restless and perplexed, they are banished to the back ranks in a macabre spectacle of totalitarian pretensions.

The focus is on the attitude to life with which one meets the challenges of disruptive, revolutionary, turbulent times.

Therefore, in the following lines, I would like to describe how I personally believe I will meet these challenges. Because unlike some of my family members, friends and acquaintances, the Covid crisis, fearmongering, propaganda and state blackmail have not been able to harm me so far. On the contrary, the past two years seem to me personally to be the most productive phase of the past decade. Among other things, I attribute this to the fact that I have always been guided by a few simple principles, which, thanks to the appropriate upbringing, were obviously considered a fixed star to me in childhood—and which have since provided me with motivation, stability and light-heartedness in a world that seems to be increasingly complex.

First,
all people are equal.

Second,
nothing is impossible.

Third,
live in the moment.

Fourth,
those who fight can win. If you don't fight, you've already lost.

Last but not least,
happiness is with those who are self-sufficient.

These short, well-known proverbs are all I need. It doesn't take lofty psychoanalysis to understand and internalize them. As trivial and clumsy as these sayings and peasant wisdom may sound to the ears of some academics, the resulting convictions are fundamental and far-reaching on in-depth analysis. And only those who possess

solid convictions, a stable personal value system and an immutable moral compass can succeed in a world that is tempted to drown universally valid values, rules and laws of nature in the vortex of permanent crises, to render them worthless and void.

This circumstance was vividly comprehensible during the Covid crisis, for example in rural or remote regions of the world, where people were usually much less panicked about Covid than the urban population because they have retained a grounded connection to their very own thoughts, their environment and traditional laws of nature. And because they are not constantly exposed to media manipulation.

Even the implications of the first maxim—all people are equal—are so far-reaching that to this day they ensure that I have no respect for meaningless titles, puffed-up institutions and materialistic deception.

Because authority is not conferred. It is not to be obtained by a uniform, a degree, a promotion, or fabulous wealth. It arises from trust in one's own abilities, through reflection, knowledge and life experience. You either have authority or you don't. And if you don't take false authorities seriously, you're not afraid of them.

This statement leads directly to the second rule of thumb—nothing is impossible—which motivates you to always do exactly what you think is right and important.

It doesn't matter if the rest of the world has a different opinion on this, does the opposite, or doesn't think your own plans are feasible. If you believe in yourself, you don't need external confirmation for your actions. This works all the better the less you seek comparison with others. It helps to avoid consuming social media.

After all, the supposedly social portals ensure permanent comparison, constant benchmarking of one's own life against the digitally polished existence of other people—and this is not only irrelevant to one's own perception of the world but downright harmful. So, it's more fruitful to talk to yourself than to consume empty content on nervous-inducing big tech platforms.

Therefore, it is advisable to concentrate on the foundation of one's own values, on one's own goals and convictions, and to consciously perceive and accept them—in the moment.

This golden rule, which is also used in Buddhism, is the key to more mindfulness in life. Savoring the moment helps you to focus on the essentials. The here and now. In any case, nothing can be done about the past. There are only lessons to be learned from it. However, once this learning process is complete, it is a good idea to leave behind what you have experienced and done and to look ahead.

But even the future should only be dealt with to a limited extent. Because it can hardly be planned, especially in turbulent times like these. In addition, it seems foolish to be afraid of potential problems.

Because even if its probability of occurrence may be high, fear paralyzes the energy in the present tense—and nothing is absolutely certain. No matter how well you have planned. And what's the point of postponed dreams, the money saved and all the good intentions if an asteroid wipes out life on our blue planet tomorrow?

Now is the time. Tomorrow it may be over. Taking the moment with fears of problems of the future, which should only be dealt

with when they have occurred, destroys the option of exploiting the full potential of the possibly pleasurable present. To paraphrase John Lennon: Life is what happens while you're planning.

The penultimate bon mot—those who fight can win, those who don't fight have already lost—underline that one should stand up for one's convictions, values and goals always and regardless of losses. Regardless of how bad the chances of success are or how powerful the resistances are.

Because at our core, we humans are not much more than our values and beliefs. Those who do not fight for what they believe in have not only given up their plans, but also themselves before the outcome is finally determined. You still feel much better when you've gone into battle and lost than when you've surrendered without a fight.

Resignation costs dignity and self-respect. Winston Churchill is quoted as saying, "Success consists in going from mistake to mistake without losing enthusiasm." This is a very sound and clever definition.

For me personally, the fifth and last-mentioned guiding principle is the decisive motto in my life. Because it holds the secret of personal happiness and individual satisfaction. I've always believed you can and should only have relationships with other people if you have managed to maintain a halfway healthy relationship with yourself.

Those who do not accept themselves, with all their strengths and weaknesses, who do not take themselves seriously, who deceive themselves or try to portray something that they are not, will never be able to be genuinely happy.

No one is perfect. You're always self-critical, looking for ways to work on yourself, to improve—that's true. However, the only measure of the success of this development should be the personal idea of the best version of oneself.

Furthermore, the final guiding principle leads to the realization that one is not dependent on receiving external confirmation for one's actions to value one's own ventures, results and creations.

Those who need other people to perceive themselves as full-fledged are living a projection, a mirage of their life—but not the life they are actually capable of leading. For example, it is relatively irrelevant to me what the rest of the world thinks of the text at hand. I'm writing it for myself. It expresses something that has arisen and matured in me and ultimately demands expression. Of course, it is edifying when many people appreciate your own work, when you receive positive feedback, encouragement and applause.

Nevertheless, one should always do things for their own sake, not to get confirmation from the outside.

I would have written this text, like countless others before, even if it had not been intended for publication. Applause is addictive and, in the long run, makes you subordinate yourself to the wishes of your audience—even if unconsciously—to get more out of it, even though you might have done something completely different without a standing ovation.

In addition, the last proverb implies that one can be content and happy even without a life partner, without family, a large circle of friends or permanent, often superficial company and distraction.

Simply because you like to spend time with yourself and consider your own ideas, goals and plans to be meaningful and valuable. Personally, for example, I hardly ever feel bored and don't need TV, smartphones, computer games or small talk at boring events to "kill" my time.

Spending time with myself gives me pleasure. Being alone is often a source of inspiration for me. Without distraction, thoughts linger longer and often more effectively than in society. Because I enjoy what I do, and I usually evaluate the respective results as relevant and positive in front of my inner jury, I never run out of ideas, tasks, plans and new goals.

On the contrary, there are always too few hours in the day to do everything I have in mind. There are still so many books to read, languages to learn, countries and cultures to discover. Countless lyrics, chords and pieces of music are waiting to be written, recorded and produced.

New manual skills need to be learned and hobbies to be tried out, passions need to be fulfilled, sporting performance needs to be improved and history, nature or the cosmos need to be better understood. The house, garden and animals also always deserve some attention—and selflessly helping other people or making them unexpectedly happy also enriches one's own life immensely.

The meaning of life, obviously, is to give meaning to life.

The first sentence of this text, which says that one cannot get the system out of man, may be true. But that's not the point. Because in my opinion, it's not about getting the system out of the human being—presumably, that's hardly realistic in our time of intellectual degeneration—it's about representing the

change in the existing system that one hopes for the future. It's about enlightenment and education. Only those who understand the ruling system from the ground up can navigate it halfway autonomously, parody it and counteract it. It is important to be a stumbling block. The first domino to fall. Or the rock in the surf, which can only be deformed by the tides over millions of years and stoically holds its position. No matter how stormy the sea is. It's about becoming the best version of yourself. This is the real revolution. In the best case, the effect lasts for generations.

Love, creativity and self-motivation are the most effective weapons in an inhumane time. If you accept this challenge, there is absolutely no reason to succumb to resignation, to feel fear or to be paralyzed by powerlessness.

Because even if you can't change the whole world in your lifetime, you can still be the one who constantly works on this vision and is always careful to give warmth, light and energy in your own universe. For yourself and others in the same orbit. Every sunrise heralds another day of possibilities. Let's take advantage of it.

Figuratively speaking, this creates gravity. And if one's own solar system, in other words, the parallel, liberal society which a critical mass is already capable of realizing, seems more attractive than the orbit assigned by a sick system to people who are still floating in weightlessness, then that solar system must inevitably grow, and, to stay with the metaphor, attract other planets, comets and asteroids scattered throughout the universe. These, in turn, generate gravity and make the new solar system the center of a brightly colored galaxy of positively charged matter.

"You have to try the impossible in order to achieve the possible." (Hermann Hesse)

10. April 2022

They Were Never Gone

That Ukraine has a massive Nazi problem is nothing new. However, the fact that Western intelligence services have been actively promoting the development of international, right-wing extremist networks since the 1950s is often ignored.

"The United States has no friends or allies, only interests." (Henry Kissinger)

The situation in Ukraine remains opaque. While the media of NATO hegemony write of Russia's war of aggression, genocide, war crimes, massacres and alleged use of poison gas, Russian television continues to speak of targeted military operations, the liberation of the population and denazification of the Donbas. Russian hardliners are calling on Putin at prime time to finally officially declare war on Ukraine to end the conflict accordingly.

The truth probably lies somewhere in between. For truth is the first casualty of every war. Both sides are engaged in propaganda and are currently waging an information war of unprecedented proportions. It is only by way of triangulation, based on all available information that we can arrive at a reasonably reliable assessment of the current situation. Even more devastating is the fact that in the Western mainstream media—as on the Covid crisis—only a frenetically dogmatized uniform opinion is presented.

However, an objective analysis of hegemonic reporting immediately reveals that many of the reports of Russian attacks and atrocities are unsubstantiated claims. An insightful and detailed analysis of the military situation in Ukraine was provided by Jacques Baud on April 5, 2022 for Uncut-News from Switzerland. Baud is a former colonel of the General Staff, a former member of Switzerland's strategic intelligence service, and a specialist in the eastern countries.

His remarks underline that much of the Western media seems fabricated and contrived. Propaganda, in other words. From the Russian storming of Kiev to alleged poison gas attacks, false witnesses and dozens of miserably edited videos to the alleged massacre in Bucha—where the Ukrainian mayor happily declared in a video contribution only a day prior to the news about the Russian massacre that the city was liberated, peaceful and the Russian army had been pushed back.

He made no mention of a massacre, piles of corpses or mass graves. The company, Maxar, that provided the revealing satellite image for the corresponding *New York Times* hate article, which, according to official information, showed streets full of corpses, is a company of the United States military-industrial complex and is primarily owned by the investment giants Blackrock and Vanguard. At the time the evidence was taken, Maxar demonstrably did not have a satellite available over the area in question. In addition, according to official time information, the photographed corpses would have been lying on the street for almost three weeks.

However, this is not what they look like on a video from Bucha. On the contrary. In the rearview mirror of the car from which the video in question was filmed, you can clearly see how one

of the supposedly lifeless bodies lying around moves its head and wants to rise. Another corpse moves its hand. The obvious staging cannot be dispelled even by the helpless fact check of the *Deutsche Welle*, which justifies the movement of the corpse with the curvature of the rear-view mirror. Not to mention the bungling portrayal of Ursula von der Leyen's consternation, who visited the alleged crime scene in order to further inflame the mood against Russia.

The Russian use of poison gas was also presented as a fact on April 11, 2022. As a verification of the report, the fact that it came from Ukraine was enough for the Western media. Do your own research? Falsification? Not at all. Also, the fact that the news came from the right-wing radical Azov battalion apparently did not worry anyone in the hegemonic editorial offices. The headline went around the world. Only three days later, as with the CBC, there was a general backpedaling and had to admit that even days later there was no evidence for the claims from Ukraine about poison gas use by Russia.

Without further ado, the mainstream media changed the tenor and asked what to do "if" the Kremlin used such weapons. There is no trace of a correction of the initial report or more detailed investigations of the extremely serious accusation, if true.

The two examples exemplify how insubstantial the reporting of dependent media is in times of war. For they are the most powerful weapons in a war that humanity has never waged before. The total information war. It is currently unclear whether this will develop into a hot conflict and escalate beyond Ukraine. If the saber-rattling, fear of war and supply bottlenecks of the international oligarchy are not enough leverage to implement the dystopian visions of a technocratic, multipolar world order

of digitalized stakeholder capitalism, then a hot war is certainly within the realm of possibility. Even if the concomitant, large-scale destruction of the surveillance infrastructure built over the past twenty years makes a devastating world or nuclear war seem rather unlikely at the moment.

At the United Nations, NATO rather than Russia is currently giving the impression that it wants to escalate the conflict. Why else would the British prevent a special session of the UN on the alleged use of poison gas, demanded by Russia? Why do various other inconsistencies, which the Russian Foreign Minister, Sergey Lavrov, pointed out to the UN General Assembly by means of documents and photos, remain uncommented by the confederation of states? Shouldn't he be generally interested in clarifying and mediating such a conflict? Why is there still no reliable footage documenting the fighting in Ukraine and, above all, the Russian attacks, as was the case with the Gulf or Kosovo wars?

After all, according to the Western powers, this is a massive offensive and a far-reaching invasion of Putin's troops. The behavior of the UN, the Western powers, the hegemonic media and the North Atlantic defense alliance currently gives every reason to believe that these parties are interested in expanding hostilities.

For the time being, it is therefore unclear whether the international technocracy will proceed in a supranationally coordinated manner and conduct the conflict in Ukraine by overarching agreement, namely to implement a common Agenda 2030 by means of a narrative and limited military deployment—or whether it is a genuine power struggle for leadership in the new multipolar world order. So, while it is indisputable that hostilities are taking place in Ukraine, it is very questionable who is fighting against whom there, what exactly the Ukrainian forces are doing in the

Donbas and to what extent Russia is actually acting militarily offensive there.

So far, all traces in the search for the actual aggressor lead to the United States. And the further back you look in history, the darker the connections with the present.

While it is well known that the United States was instrumental in the preparations for the Maidan revolution and the regime change in Ukraine, and has been trying to "democratize" the country along the lines of Pax Americana with NGOs for at least a decade, the fact that Washington has been sympathizing, collaborating with and financing eugenicists and Nazis for over a century is often swept under the carpet. The origins of the massive Nazi problem in today's Ukraine can be traced back to the end of the Second World War. The common thread: the CIA.

The fact that there is a massive Nazi problem in today's Ukraine cannot be completely suppressed by the mainstream media, despite massive censorship of everything that has to do with Russia and the current conflict, as evidenced by an article in the *Frankfurter Rundschau* of April 20, 2022, which documents the connections of Ukraine's uncouth ambassador to Germany—Andriy Melnyk—to the ultra-right-wing Azov battalion. In addition, there is a CNN article from March 30, 2022, which also emphasizes the key role of the Azov Nazis in the Ukrainian army. Even the *Washington Post* on April 6, 2022, could not help but call a spade a spade and describe the far-right Azov militias as the leading force in Ukraine's defense. *Daily Veracity* recently reported that the right-wing radical fighters of the new EU protectorate prefer and massively stimulate themselves with Captagon, a meth-like drug that has already been in vogue in Syria, and reduces the sensation of pain.

Until the start of the so-called Russian special operation in Donbas, the topic, as well as the corruption allegations against Zelenskyy and his clan regime, which are mentioned several times in the Pandora Papers, had also been openly addressed in the mainstream media, as my article of March 27, 2022 illustrates.

As early as March 2018, *THE HILL* reported that the US Congress had blocked funds for the support of the ultra-right Azov Battalion, which only accepts Nazis, and blocked payments—which was reversed a short time later under pressure from the Pentagon. And on April 20, 2022, the *Jerusalem Post* published an article that examines why neo-Nazi militias in Ukraine also use Israeli weapons in battle.

Since the Ukraine conflict pushed the Covid crisis off the front pages at lightning speed, no one in the hegemonic editorial offices seems to be bothered by supporting avowed Nazis. And the Azov Battalion is just one of many openly racist groups in Ukraine. There is also the 72nd Mechanized Brigade, which has existed since the 1940s and whose honorary member, Oleksiy Arestovych, now advises Zelenskyy. In addition there is the Georgian Legion or the Patriot of Ukraine Organization, which was allegedly disbanded in 2014.

How these groups think about the people in Donbas, most of whom have Russian roots, is shown in an interview with the Ukrainian journalist Bohdan Butkevych, who openly expresses what the goals of the Azov battalion and its henchmen are when he states:

> **"(...) that there are at least 1.5 million unnecessary people living in Donbas, (...) that there is a certain category of people there who should simply be killed."**

The linked fact check on this video interview is intended to refute the statements as a compilation of Russian propaganda channels—but ironically simply confirms the authenticity of the video. On some social media portals, Stop Fake is also criticized for lack of context in its excerpt of the video. In response, Stop Fake, then offered just that, citing instead the entire text by Butkevych. The latter does not relativize or invalidate anything and continues to openly call for genocide in the Donbas. There is no doubt about that.

The fact that a fascist project such as the Myrotvorets archive is not banned in Ukraine also illustrates whose brainchild the regime in Kiev is. The organization's website publicly lists nearly 190,000 so-called "enemies of Ukraine," along with addresses and phone numbers, and is growing daily. Anyone of Russian and Hungarian origin or railing against the regime in Kiev ends up in the online pillory. And quite a few people who appear on the list are murdered within a few days.

The Azov network arguably functions as a label or umbrella organization for dispersed neo-Nazi units and has successfully infiltrated Ukraine's government, military, judiciary and police over the past twenty years. So much so that today it represents the dominant network in the country's state apparatus and occupies key positions. It is also financed, trained and connected by the CIA and its NGO vehicles such as USAID, NED or WEF.

The fact that the hegemonic forces have been determining the course of events in Russia's neighboring state with financial means since 2014 is nothing new. The fact that the CIA has been openly supporting Nazi groups there for a decade with the support of the Pentagon was also no secret in the past, as corresponding articles from the time before Russia's invasion of Donbas show.

On the other hand, the fact that the CIA has been involved in Ukraine since 1953 and supports right-wing movements both monetarily and organizationally is probably less well known.

The covert build-up and geopolitical instrumentalization of extremists in foreign countries has a long tradition among the Anglo-American elite. Thus, American high finance, namely Prescott Sheldon Bush, among others, not only financed Adolf Hitler and the NSDAP (up until the official entry of the United States into the war on December 11, 1941), but Al-Qaeda, too, would have been inconceivable without Washington's involvement. The American intelligence services have their fingers in the game all over the world. The list is endless.

Even more interesting for understanding the current situation is the fact that both the CIA and the British MI6 supported right-wing radical formations in Ukraine as early as the early 1950s in order to stir up and amplify anti-Russian resentment.

A declassified secret document of the CIA dated July 13, 1953, proves that with Project Aerodynamic and Project Capacho, psychological warfare as well as tangible military and intelligence operations against the superpower were already on the agenda of the victorious Western powers at that time. Although the Second World War had only just ended. An article by investigative journalist Wayne Madsen from January 14, 2016 sheds light on this background and explains why the Azov Battalion, as the historical successor of the Nazi groups from the Second World War, still pays homage to the Ukrainian Nazi leader Stepan Bandera, who is buried in Munich.

A banner of the Nazi idol even prominently adorned the entrance to the headquarters of the Euromaidan in 2014—the headquarters of the supposed democratization of Ukraine.

On the occasion of Stepan Bandera's birthday, huge commemorative marches regularly take place in Ukraine, as the *Times of Israel* condemns on January 1, 2022.

WELTEXPRESS also published an article along the same lines in 2019. The 69-year history of the CIA's support of Nazism in Ukraine and the role of Stepan Bandera was also reported by truthundercover on March 27, 2022. Incidentally, according to an article in the Israeli newspaper *Haaretz* on August 22, 2019, Bandera's grandson, Steve, currently lives in Canada and is trying to play down his grandfather's Nazi crimes as Russian propaganda in order to persuade Jewish Holocaust victims and high-ranking rabbis to "accept Ukraine's historical identity."

In an article published on May 1, 2001, the Institute for Policy Studies reports in detail on the CIA's unscrupulous collaboration with Nazis in Germany and other countries. In addition, the corresponding text spans the temporal arc further and refers to the Gehlen organization, the predecessor organization of the Federal Intelligence Service. It was named after Reinhard Gehlen, who held the position of head of the Foreign Armies East Division in the Wehrmacht under Hitler.

Gehlen was a Nazi through and through. Nevertheless, in the context of the Nuremberg trials, he was classified only as a follower and became a key figure for the CIA in Germany shortly after the war. On April 1, 2016, *Die Welt* wrote about this inglorious founding story of the Bundesnachrichtendienst (BND), Germany's foreign intelligence service: "Lies and nasty tricks—that's how the BND came into being."

After its official founding, the BND employed such illustrious figures as Heinrich Himmler's daughter, Gudrun Burwitz, as

documented by the British *The Independent* in June 2018. The "Butcher of Lyon," Klaus Barbie, the cruel head of Hitler's Gestapo in Lyon and a war criminal convicted several times, also worked for the new German secret service after the end of the war until the early 1970s.

Stern issue number 42 of October 9, 1980 contains an article about Klaus Barbie, who at that time was making a career as an advisor to the president of Bolivia. He died of cancer on September 25, 1991, 46 years after the end of the war.

Franz Six, head of the SS Advance Command Moscow in 1941, also worked for the BND, and thus also the CIA, regardless of his past. A corresponding article in *Stern* can even be found as a black-and-white scan of a print edition on the Central Intelligence Agency's own archive page. And the list goes on and on: SS-Standartenführer Walther Rauff, SS-Oberführer Dr. Friedrich Panziger, SS-Hauptsturmführer Dr. Hermann Hübig, et cetera. Hartmann Lauterbacher, SS brigade leader, Gauleiter of Hanover, deputy to the Reich Youth Leader von Schirach, was even an "advisor to the Sultanate of Oman on youth issues" as a BND agent until the end of the 1970s.

Many top Nazis escaped prosecution for a long time. This was also the case for Adolf Eichmann, who lived in Argentina until 1960 and even rose to the position of head of department at Mercedes-Benz in Buenos Aires. Even Josef Mengele, the so-called Angel of Death, lived in Argentina and Paraguay before he drowned off the coast of Brazil in 1979 after a heart attack. Hitler's rocket builder, SS member Wernher von Braun, also became a high-ranking figure in the US Army and NASA after 1945. He posed with Walt Disney and worked for presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy. The latter even appointed von Braun as technical director of the American moon

landing program. Together with his team of engineers imported from Germany, Braun was tasked with ensuring that the United States gained and retained the upper hand against Russia in the struggle for supremacy in space. The Cold War was in full swing.

The so-called "father of modern space medicine," Hubertus Strughold, also made a career at NASA thanks to the CIA and despite his Nazi past—although he acquired most of his knowledge through experiments with and on concentration camp prisoners, whom he froze in vacuum cabins, among other things, and regularly killed in the process. As you can see, the United States also cooperates with monsters when it serves the hegemonic interests of the superpower.

However, the involvement of US intelligence agencies in the activities of supposedly exploding domestic right-wing terrorism is no less grotesque in the present. FBI documents suggest that the United States is also indirectly supporting Nazi groups in its own country through the CIA-funded Azov Battalion. For example, during the riots in Charlottesville on August 12, 2017. The goal is to further expand the police state of the United States through the targeted launch of an enemy of the state classified as a terrorist group at home.

On February 15, 2019, Bellingcat, an online independent investigative collective, also reported in detail on connections between the Ukrainian Azov Battalion and the American neo-Nazi organization Rise Above Movement, which was founded in 2017. And as recently as January 2021, *TIME* magazine wrote about the inspiring role that the Azov Battalion is playing for the international neo-Nazi scene, as well as the fact that Ukrainian extremists are successfully recruiting new members worldwide via Facebook, with many of them coming from the United States. Moreover, the

FBI continued to have no problem financing a book by Kaleb Cole, a high-ranking member of the internationally networked neo-Nazi group Atomwaffen Division, which was founded in 2013, according to court documents from the United States.

Due to the Freedom of Information Act, the CIA's virtual reading room is a rich resource for documents proving the Nazi past of Anglo-American hegemony in general and Ukraine in particular. A glance at the past makes it clear that neither the United States nor Britain has ever been reluctant to work with extremists, regardless of their political affiliation, to advance their own interests—and this includes Russia, the only serious competitor to Anglo-American hegemony.

After all, China is not a threat but merely a socio-economic laboratory for the Western powers and has been controlled from Washington since Mao's time. The background to this is highlighted in my text Mao, Yale and the Hegemony of January 21, 2022.

Considering this information, it must be assumed that Western turbo-capitalism has simply reached the end of its systemic half-life and will implode in the near future—and that an escalating war thus represents the interests of Western hegemony. After all, the first two world wars were also unleashed based on economic interests and were primarily due to the subversive activities of Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-American high finance. Cunning bankers have always financed both sides of a conflict to be able to make money from both parties in the end.

Then as now: The totalitarian system, understood as the supranational, multipolar world order, now comprising a superclass of about 7,000 people controlled by means of corporatism, creates

crisis situations all over the world in order to legitimize its authoritarian and inhumane policies before human civilization.

Because if it didn't do that with all the means at its disposal, it would be over tomorrow. In that regard, it should be noted that a study from 2017 shows that around 65 percent of global internet traffic was already generated automatically at that time, by bots.

It doesn't take much imagination to imagine what this means for social media portals, the efficiency of state propaganda, and the representation and perception of majorities in 2022.

The reality curated by big tech is a simulation and the internet at its top level is dead, controlled and censored by an invisible Ministry of Truth. This becomes abundantly clear when you type a term like climate change into Google. Although Google reports in a fraction of a second that it has found tens of millions of search results, it stops displaying them from the 385th link on, on page 39. Apart from contributions from state-recognized bodies that align with the official narrative, there are no other hits. It shows no free blog, no independent study, no opposing opinion. This also applies to the Ukraine conflict and other narratives. Yes, there is a war going on. Maybe even World War III. It is not between East and West but between a neo-feudalist, technocratic system and the human family it oppresses.

April 23, 2022

Twitter, Tricolor and Total Hysteria

We've seen the Twitter takeover by Elon Musk, anomalies in the presidential election in France, and utmost belligerence of NATO in matters Russia. There is hysteria everywhere you look, alongside contradictions and cognitive dissonance.

Elon Musk bought Twitter, exposing the hollowness of the left-rotating bubble of the "woke" neo-socialists. Musk announced unconditional freedom of expression—which said clientele automatically associates with the approval of right-wing positions. Anyone who does not demonstrate unconditional solidarity with the current narrative and who contradicts the consensus opinion must be a Nazi. And that included Elon Musk, who was born in South Africa, albeit in privileged circumstances.

Nevertheless, many wokists had announced in the run-up to the Twitter takeover that they intended to leave the platform should the PayPal founder and Tesla boss become the majority owner or even owner of platform. Yet, ironically, Musk's clientele of Tesla drivers and PayPal users appears to consist of affluent boomer greens and neo-socialists, a strata of society that has made it to the bourgeoisie, eager to support a fascistic, biometric segregation from the comfort of their spacious suburban homes, from where they can place online orders using PayPal during lockdowns.

Elon Musk announced that he wants to take action against propaganda, censorship and bots that make open discourse on Twitter difficult or impossible. His solution is to demand the unique authentication of all users as human beings. A double-edged sword. While some can afford to express their opinions openly in politically explosive times, others must fear social, professional or financial reprisals if they make use of their right to freedom of expression. Thanks to cancel culture, which is becoming more and more extreme.

So far, it is unclear how the new Twitter owner intends to implement the verification of users as *Homo sapiens*. Possible means include: digital tools that recognize whether a human or a bot is controlling the account; video identification, where an employee of a service provider verifies the user via the smartphone's camera; or even the upload of proof of identity. Whatever the process on Twitter will be in detail, it may mean the end of what's left of the anonymous use of the platform and open the door to the personalized internet—a wet dream of the digital-financial oligarchy.

Thus, the noble words of the richest person in the world should be taken with a grain of salt. Because Musk is certainly not the savior of the market liberals, the savior of freedom of expression and democracy, or the self-made man driven exclusively by idealism that he prefers to portray. He advocates digital payment systems, is in favor of universal basic income, has been in contact with Peter Thiel (Palantir, PayPal, Facebook) for twenty years, has met the convicted child trafficker and molester Jeffrey Epstein (who died in prison under dubious circumstances) and his accomplice Ghislaine Maxwell—a fact, despite Musk's efforts at relativization—and works with his company Neuralink at the forefront of the fusion of man and machine, which is

transhumanism. Thus, the opaque billionaire and new Twitter boss does not necessarily give the impression of being subscribed to altruistic humanism.

"Artificial intelligence is probably the best—or the worst—thing that can happen to humanity." (Stephen Hawking)

In parallel to the supposedly hostile takeover of what is probably the most important social media portal in the world for the oligarchy, the presidential election in France dominated the headlines of the past few days. There, too, the leading media, analogous to the Twitter farce, painted the devil on the wall, fantasized about contingency plans in Brussels, and loudly proclaimed the end of democracy and the pan-European idea should Emmanuel Macron's opponent, Marine Le Pen, win the election. At times, Le Pen even had a veritable lead over the ex-Rothschild investment banker, winning over many of his former constituencies with as much as a seventy percent majority. In the end, however, Le Pen lost, as expected, to the WEF favorite Macron.

However, the circumstances under which this occurred are strange, and have an undeniable resemblance with inconsistencies in the last US election. In France, too, the result changed drastically shortly before the end of election day. Within a very short time, Marine Le Pen apparently lost over one million votes, as Journalistenwatch reported on April 25, 2022.

On the streets of Paris after the election, angry citizens of the Grande Nation controlled by Macron showed what they thought of the outcome and accused the state and the media of manipulation. This is not an unfounded suspicion, as various elections in recent years have shown. Again and again, seemingly organic results that had grown over the course of the day changed at the last moment

and abruptly in favor of the candidate preferred by the oligarchy. This was often accompanied by phenomena that are difficult to explain by logic or mathematics. There was also the clumsy claim of French television that they had simply shown false figures.

It seems that digitalization and the Fourth Industrial Revolution are not really conducive to democracy, especially where the much-criticized Dominion voting machines are used. And the role of external interference should not be neglected either. After all, by the end of the Cold War, the United States alone had tried to shape government as it saw fit in no less than 72 sovereign countries, as an article in the *Washington Post* on December 23, 2016 summed up.

Even more devastating: Advocates of cancel culture would probably be in favor of elections being rigged to prevent a national conservative party from coming to power. Centralism, state encroachment and deeply anti-democratic media censorship regarding Covid and the Ukraine conflict are also advocated.

How else can one explain that publications such as *WELT* or *NZZ* have recently written exactly the opposite of what had been the consensus in the mainstream media up until Russia's invasion of Donbas—namely, that Ukraine is dominated by a network of neo-Nazi militias.

On January 7, 2021, journalists Simon Shuster and Billy Perrigo reported extensively for *TIME* magazine on the role of the right-wing radical Azov movement in Ukraine and its links with international neo-Nazi groups. The article in question states:

"Its fighters resemble the other para-military units—and there are dozens of them—that have helped defend Ukraine against

the Russian military over the past six years. But Azov is much more than a militia. It has its own political party; two publishing houses; summer camps for children; and a vigilante force known as the National Militia, which patrols the streets of Ukrainian cities alongside the police.
Unlike its ideological peers in the U.S. and Europe, it also has a military wing with at least two training bases and a vast arsenal of weapons, from drones and armored vehicles to artillery pieces.
The movement arose as a product of the revolution that swept Ukraine in 2014. (...) They included Andriy Biletsky, who had spent the previous two years in jail on charges of attempted murder. (...) Ukrainian police had long treated his organization, Patriot of Ukraine, as a neo-Nazi terrorist group. Biletsky's nickname within the group was Bely Vozhd, or White Ruler, and his manifesto seemed to pluck its narrative straight from Nazi ideology. (...) Biletsky told TIME in an interview this winter in Ukraine that the insignia he chose for the militia combined two symbols—the "black sun" and the "wolf's hook"—both of which were used by the German Nazis during World War II. (...)
Outside Ukraine, Azov occupies a central role in a network of extremist groups stretching from California across Europe to New Zealand, according to law enforcement officials on three continents. And it acts as a magnet for young men eager for combat experience. Ali Soufan, a security consultant and former FBI agent who has studied Azov, estimates that more than 17,000 foreign fighters have come to Ukraine over the past six years from 50 countries."

This short excerpt from a little more than a year ago gives an idea of how serious the states of cognitive dissonance must be among the self-proclaimed do-gooders, peace demonstrators and pseudo-pacifists with their Ukraine flags, who are currently pleading in blind hysteria for more arms deliveries to Kiev, all the while the United States-financed Azov Movement is pulling

the strings there as a criminal-militant umbrella organization for various Nazi associations and has been persecuting people with Russian roots in the Donbas for a decade.

This is not a small group of thugs. The right-wing extremist organization's in-house YouTube channel currently has 117,000 subscribers and illustrates the influence the movement now has in Ukraine.

A comprehensive report by the MPP research project of the Center for International Security & Cooperation (CSIAC), a nebulous but influential joint venture of the US Department of Defense and Stanford University, also goes into detail about the right-wing extremist backgrounds of the dominant force in Ukraine in an update from March 2022 and shows more than clearly that the West is supporting on the Russian border what it always pretended to be fighting: fascism. "Fun fact" on the side: It was also the right-wing radical Azov movement that received the official mandate to secure the elections in Ukraine in 2014.

So, while on April 26, 2022 more than 40 states under US supervision are discussing in Rammstein how to bring Russia to its knees militarily, economically and in the media, people continue to die in Ukraine. Especially innocent bystanders. Ukraine's secret service and military, all led by the Azov network, execute disagreeable diplomats by shooting them in the head in front of courthouses, abducting critical journalists and intellectuals, and allegedly abusing civilians in a steel mill as human shields.

Because this steel mill is the last support of the Nazi militia in the area. And Russia has already officially announced that it does not want to storm or take over the industrial site, but simply to seal it off. Now it remains to be seen whether the hopelessly entrenched Azov soldiers will eventually surrender

and let the civilians go unharmed or whether they will have to fear even worse.

The latter could include having to serve as a bargaining chip or false flag victim for a further escalation of the conflict.

Contrary to the portrayal of Western mainstream media, Russia does not seem to be carrying out a dully aggressive invasion in order to take over the whole of Ukraine but is concentrating on holding the position after securing the Donbas in order to keep its own losses low.

NATO seems to be the main focus on escalation. One can only speculate about the extent of the actual fighting or the detailed losses of both sides. This applies equally to the further course of the crisis, even though the decision of the German government, following the famous Rammstein meeting, to supply heavy weapons to Zelenskyy and co. does not really speak for a timely de-escalation of the situation. Unfortunately.

> **"These truths are well known among our principal men who are now engaged in forming an imperialism to govern the world. By dividing the voter through the political party system, we can get them to expend their energies in fighting for questions of no importance."**
> **(Montagu Norman, Governor of the Bank of England, New York, 1924)**

The situation is similar with the Covid crisis. In most countries around the world, anti-viral measures have been temporarily scaled back or completely abolished, but the zero-Covid champion China is currently impressively demonstrating to human civilization what awaits it if Western states—as often postulated

by local leaders—orient themselves to China's model for combating Covid. Apocalyptic scenes from Shanghai are making the rounds on the internet.

People who have been locked up in their homes for weeks and are starving are calling for help by the thousands on high-rise balconies. Even if there is no one there to help them. The food is supplied by the state but is often rotten or does not arrive at all. It is forbidden to leave the house.

Hundreds of Chinese police roam the streets, wrapped in white protective suits, carrying out mass testing or disinfection measures. Doors are screwed and welded shut. Pets are picked up, stuffed into bags and thrown somewhere, or beaten to death on the spot. Chickens are individually checked for Covid with test sticks. The streets are paroled by the robot dogs of Boston Dynamics—creating a morbid atmosphere—and if you stand too long on the balcony of your dreary apartment complex to scream for food, you will get a visit from a drone that asks you to stay inside. A dystopian nightmare.

Once the EU introduces the digital vaccination certificate on July 1, 2022, it can be assumed that it will also be used in the near future. This is likely to be the case at the latest when the WHO's new pandemic treaty comes into force and grants the democratically illegitimate organization powers that are little inferior to those of the Chinese state leadership. This is because the WHO can centrally declare lockdowns or decide on compulsory vaccination for all 194 member states, in other words, almost the entire planet, when the new agreement comes into force. And the nation states will have to implement it. There is not much time left to do something about this totalitarian request.

"*The intergovernmental negotiating body (INB), tasked with drafting and negotiating this Pandemic Treaty, will then deliver a progress report to the 76th World Health Assembly in May of 2023, with the aim of adopting the 'instrument' by 2024.*" (American Policy Center)

Germany, too, is unerringly on its ghost ride towards zero-Covid. This is closely followed by Italy and Austria, where far-reaching restrictions are also still in place. From industry-specific vaccination requirements to mandatory masks and other regulations to entry restrictions, we are seeing a colorful bouquet of fascistic methods of oppression.

In authoritarian audacity, the respective governments ignore the fact that there are no piles of corpses on the streets in surrounding countries even without such restrictions—and that the flimsy incidences are in no way an indicator of any health emergency. In Switzerland, all measures were abolished weeks ago. Hardly anyone wears a mask anymore. The restaurants, shops and gyms are full—as are the supermarket shelves. Partitions, signs and stickers have been removed. There is even under-mortality. It's almost like 2019. Except for the uneasy feeling that arises every now and then about the knowledge that it's not over.

It only helps to a limited extent that a topic such as vaccine side effects is now tentatively arriving in the mainstream. Because, for example, as Tim Röhn's initially investigative efforts for WELT illustrate, even the reappraisal of the Covid crisis approved by the leading media remains dutifully within the limits of the valid narrative—even if Tim Röhn does a good job as a journalist on the topics he tackles.

As long as Mr. Röhn does not write—or is not allowed to write—anything about Event 201, the financing of the WHO, the de facto

co-ordination of the corporate media, or the digital surveillance infrastructure of bio-totalitarianism installed during the alleged pandemic—he will only supply the part of the population annoyed by political failure with a sedative—with "hopium."

And this is a dangerous, because paralyzing drug, which reinforces the fatal fallacy that external forces will take over the salvation of one's own existence at the appropriate time. The solution to the real problem, however, can always be found within each and every person.

> **"Developing a future-oriented alternative to the perspective of fear is a central challenge for society." (Frank Furedi, How Fear Works: Culture of Fear in the Twenty-First Century)**

The Day After

"The inventions in favor of people are suppressed, and those that are against them are promoted." (Bertolt Brecht)

"Pershing II" was one of the first English words I knew as a child. It is the designation of a US medium-range missile, a nuclear surface-to-surface missile that was equipped with a thermonuclear warhead of the type W85. It had a range of about 1,800 km and could reach targets in western Russia within five minutes from southern Germany. It was the early 1980s, the time of the Cold War, a term coined by George Orwell in his essay "You and the Atomic Bomb" in 1945. The fronts had hardened.

The West German peace movement protested loudly against the stationing of nuclear warheads on domestic soil. However, after the disarmament negotiations between the nuclear powers agreed, in the NATO Double-Track Decision of December 12, 1979, had been unsuccessful, the German Bundestag decided on November 22, 1983 to approve the stationing of US nuclear weapons in the country. This was completed in 1985 and a total of 120 of the deadly weapon of mass destruction were distributed in the Federal Republic of Germany. Apart from Germany, no other country did the United States this favor.

I had picked up the military weapon name "Pershing II" on the radio, which was in operation almost continuously at home, and later saw a few pictures of the missiles on the evening news. At

that time, there was only ARD, ZDF and the regional program. Accordingly, visual information was scarce.

And because of my early enthusiasm for flying machines of all kinds, I drew rockets all the time. Having been already extremely fond of music at the tender age of five or six, and eager to sing English song lyrics, such as by the Beatles, and to emulate the sound of their voices, the phonetically absorbing term “Pershing II” also exerted a certain fascination with me.

Unfortunately, I can’t remember what my parents said or explained to me in this regard—but as avowed pacifists, they certainly didn’t take the latent danger of nuclear war with the playful, childlike ease that I displayed in dealing with drawn or handcrafted rockets. The topic of nuclear warfare dominated the news of the time and created fear. At the beginning of the 1980s, military strategists spoke in all seriousness of the fact that nuclear war had become more precise and thus more manageable. Then as now—absolute madness.

In addition to the Berlin Blockade of 1948/1949 and the Cuban Missile Crisis, the dispute over the stationing of medium-range missiles in Western Europe from 1979 to 1983 was one of the three most critical phases of the Cold War.

Never has the world been closer to a fatal and lethal nuclear exchange of blows between the superpowers than at these three points in history. Until today, it seems.

The steadily escalating Ukraine crisis is bringing this forgotten horror scenario back into the public eye. Political actors such as the Maoist and China fan Robert Habeck are foolishly saying these days that they are not afraid of a third world war. So-called security

experts explain on ZDF that one should not be afraid of Putin's bombs, although fear is constantly stirred up in Mainz and as early as May 5, 2022, "*Moscow simulates nuclear attack in Kaliningrad.*"

The *Beobachter Gesundheit* gives tips on how to mentally control the panic of a nuclear war, while the German BBK (Federal Office for Civil Protection and Disaster Assistance) is already recommending that the population stock up on emergency supplies and have marching baggage ready in the wake of the Ukraine crisis.

On the website wikiHow you can find a very comprehensive, illustrated guide entitled "Seinen Atomkrieg überleben" (Surviving a nuclear war). Reading the numerous, presumably only partially helpful tips for mastering the nuclear apocalypse should make every normal person feel a little queasy.

Court reporter Ruprecht Polenz is nevertheless tempted by the daring formulation "if you want to prevent a nuclear war, you must not let Putin win" in the propaganda multiplier *ZEIT ONLINE* on April 30, 2022. Such a statement is not only false and out of touch with reality but also testifies to the deliberate negation of facts and historical background to the Ukraine crisis. Yet we should know better than that.

For example, the RAND Corporation, an influential think tank of US hegemony founded in 1948, published a telling, 354-page strategy paper in 2019 under the headline "Overextending and Unbalancing Russia." A strategy to overstretch and unbalance Russia—economically, militarily and socially—with the singular aim of preserving the geopolitical dominance of the United States. It was a well-thought-out script for the final humiliation and defeat of the eternal class enemy as well as the preservation of the unipolar world order, the Pax Americana.

The approach of the RAND Corporation: Accelerate NATO's eastward expansion, destroy Russia's reputation in the world, fuel a cost-intensive nuclear arms race, arm Ukraine in order to prevent a military proxy conflict with Putin in order to then bring the former Soviet Union to its knees financially by means of international sanctions—legitimized by the seething war.

It is astonishing how much the approach outlined in the RAND strategy paper resembles the current events on the outer borders of the giant empire. It almost seems as if the geostrategists in Washington are following the recommendations of their expensive think tanks. This could also be observed in the course of the Covid crisis, which unquestionably resembled the lock-step pandemic scenario developed by the Rockefeller Foundation, as journalist Norbert Häring reported in detail on May 28, 2020.

What the RAND Corporation's totalitarian crisis script does not address in detail are the acute risks of potential nuclear escalation. Because it ends with the possible germination of a military conflict and concludes simply with the remark:

"*Even if the Army were not directly involved in extending Russia per se, it would play a key role in mitigating the possible blowback. All the options to extend Russia incur some risk. As a result, enhancing U.S. deterrence posture in Europe and increasing U.S. military capabilities (…) might need to go hand in hand with any move to extend Russia, as a way of hedging against the chance of tensions with Russia escalating into conflict.*"

The United States obviously sees the use of nuclear weapons as an effective means of achieving this. Why else have Americans been modernizing their arsenal for years and spending billions

of dollars on it? This only makes sense if you plan to use these weapons at some point.

The plot for the events following the flare-up of a military confrontation with Russia is presumably classified and is only available to insiders in the White House, Pentagon, CIA headquarters, and allies in the EU and NATO headquarters.

This is unfortunate. After all, an insight into the current military simulations and strategic scenarios of NATO hegemony would be helpful to clarify whether the arrogance of the West has reached a point where one would accept nuclear war in order to put Russia and China in their place and sit at the head of the global club of technocrats. It is not a conflict of systems (e.g., capitalism, socialism, communism), even if the media likes to portray it that way, but rather power struggles within the international oligarchy. The three power blocs are fighting for supremacy in the totalitarian world order of the near future.

The only question is: Are they doing this consensually, or are we dealing with serious, armed conflicts on Russia's borders that ultimately have to be decided militarily? The RAND strategy paper seems to assume that economic and information warfare, accompanied by NATO threats, will be enough to decide the race in favor of the Western values. It is to be hoped that this interpretation of the document is correct. Otherwise, modern civilization runs the risk of bombing itself back into the Stone Age. The film *The Day After* from 1983 impressively shows what this looks like.

The two-hour-long film by director Nicholas Meyer is visually stunning, frightening, sobering and depressing. It shows not only how a Cold War can turn into a nuclear war in a matter of days but also what its terrible consequences are.

Even a short compilation, a little more than eight minutes long, makes it clear that you must be an absolute fool not to be afraid of thermonuclear attacks.

In the film, after the destruction of NATO headquarters, the United States commander-in-chief gives the order for a nuclear strike. The corresponding NATO protocol will be activated and the missile silos will be made operational. The script leaves open who will lead the first strike. What is clear is that as soon as the warheads of the West are on their way, Russia will launch a counterattack with 300 intercontinental ballistic missiles and bomb the United States into the Stone Age.

All over the land of opportunity, fiery mushroom clouds are soaring into the sky. Metropolises are wiped out in seconds, living beings, plants and buildings evaporate in conflagrations around the impact site, entire regions are wiped off the face of the earth—and large parts of the population die in the first minutes after the nuclear warheads explode. Indeed, some 90 million within a few hours, as calculated by a simulation with the somewhat eerie title "Plan A" from Princeton University in 2019.

However, the real horror is just beginning. Because the worst scenes in the film are those that show the state of the world two weeks after the nuclear strikes. There is anomie in the country, and chaos and destruction everywhere you look. Nuclear snow rains down from ash clouds in the darkened sky. Pre-industrial conditions.

The cities are uninhabitable, and the survivors suffer from radiation sickness. Hair and teeth fall out. For some, within a few hours or days, for others it takes weeks. A cruel death in installments. Everything is dying, withering.

Refugee camps are being built in the ruins. Epidemics break out. Military commandos shoot people indiscriminately. The justice system, courts and trials no longer exist. And in order to survive, the civilians end up arming themselves and killing each other. Absolute barbarism.

The Day After does not declare who wins this war, does not name a winner. Probably because director Nicholas Meyer was painfully aware that there can be no winners in a full-blown nuclear war.

It signifies the end of modern civilization. It is not for nothing that Albert Einstein warned early on against the military misuse of corresponding scientific findings. Thus, the film from the Cold War era also leaves the end open. It is not Hollywood finale with a happy ending. The oppressive feelings remain. Neither Will Smith nor James Bond shows up to save the world at the last minute. It's broken. Dead. A nuclear-contaminated desert. Not a glimmer of hope on the horizon.

Those who were unfortunate enough to survive the first strikes die slowly but surely—and above all in agony.

Perhaps today's top politicians, dogmatists, propagandists and warmongers should look at this film before frivolously considering such options. I've only seen *The Day After* once in my life—a few months after I first heard the term "Pershing II" on the radio as a small kid and curiously asked my parents what it was all about—that was enough.

The impressions still have an effect today. More than thirty years later, I am still aware of the immovable, indisputable fact that nuclear war must never occur. Anyone who has seen this movie will subscribe to this.

I, for one, will never forget how one night I secretly sat in front of the TV in the dark living room of our attic apartment at home. Actually, I was only allowed to watch selected children's shows a few times a week. But my parents were already asleep. It must have been around 11 p.m., because after the late films it was usually the end of the broadcast. And that was usually around 1 or 1:30 am.

Just as I turned on the small TV, the feature film that still resonates with me today began "im Ersten" (one of the main TV channels, *The Day After*. At first fascinated by the many rockets and somehow still fascinated by the huge explosions that trigger atomic bombs, which were unknown to me until then, I remained spellbound. As if petrified. Until the final scene, in which a handful of radiation-contaminated, torn, rotting people, who have hardly any hair on their heads and look like zombies, were lying powerlessly in each other's arms and sobbing helplessly in the dusty ruins of an empty city. The camera zoomed out, and then faded to black—until a last, thin, lonely pleading voice remained in the ether:

"Hello, is anybody there? Anybody at all?"

Constituted Crime

"I wonder what I see in the future. And you know what I see? I see pitchforks." (Nick Hanauer)

He did it—like so many politicians, corporate executives, financial moguls and pseudo-philanthropists before him. Whether Cecil Rhodes in the nineteenth century, Margaret Thatcher in 1990 at the Aspen Institute, David Rockefeller, who used the term at the Bilderberg conference in Baden-Baden in 1991, George Bush Sr., who used the geopolitical catch phrase" in a speech at the UN in January of the same year, Emmanuel Macron and Bill Gates, Angela Merkel, Justin Trudeau and Boris Johnson, Henry Kissinger, Pope Francis, Klaus Schwab or Kerry Chant, Chief Health Officer of Australia—to name just a few. They have all called for a "new world order"; or unceremoniously proclaimed one themselves. Among these are Christian Lindner, from the supposedly liberal FDP.

Although the pathetic-sounding phrase has long been common parlance in the softened public relations jargon of international corporatism, it causes a murmur in the forest of leaves and social media bubbles every time a representative of this very constituted criminality brings it out on mainstream channels or the political stage.

Those who have recognized the totalitarian system for what it is, may see themselves vindicated, point the finger at the alleged

"conspirator" and resolve never to vote for the FDP again. The others, those who still subscribe to political parties, ideologues, dogmatists and useful idiots, try in panicked actionism to relativize the phrase and refute it with meaningless newspeak, to downplay its significance.

For even if the New World Order is part of the geopolitical repertoire of platitudes of every internationally active top politician, the expression still has a whiff of the dubious.

Serious public debates about questionable economic policy contexts, corruption and technocracy are not being held, criticism and complaints are ignorantly dismissed as "conspiracy theory." In that context, the infantilizing opinion-makers are meticulously careful to paint as ridiculous a picture as possible on the subject, such as that of conspiratorial meetings in dark back rooms, circumstantial secrecy, mysticism, contract killing and suitcases of money. Above all, the presentation of the topic in the leading media is dubious—because the fascist Duce of Italy, Benito Mussolini, had already recognized at the time:

> **"Fascism should be called corporatism—because it is the perfect fusion of the power of government and corporations."**

For example, today's cancel culture, debilitating framing and algorithmized censorship distract the average consumer from realizing that the prevailing political system, combined with the monopolizing platform economy, is the consummation of Mussolini's vision of perfect fascism.

It's not about the conspiracy of a handful of rich villains who meet in remote walls to control the fate of the planet by means of

magical formulas. They are not comprised of a few conspiratorial gentlemen of advanced age who forge secret plans to achieve world domination, but rather an internationally networked, intergenerational and interdisciplinary organized clan of the super-rich and their accomplices.

The totalitarian corporatism that one is confronted with in 2022 is based on laws, framework agreements, regulations and shareholdings. It is also based on representative democracy, which is more aptly described as repressive democracy.

An organizational chart created by the British author Iain Davis for his book *Pseudo-Pandemic*, published in 2021, explains the current power structures of the supranational oligarchy very aptly. It is the "rules-based international order," global "stakeholder capitalism," the woke-green "socialist democracy" that oppresses populations worldwide in a modern, digitized way. At the end of the day, however, behind all the aloof-sounding labels that feign inclusion, there is nothing more than traditional fascism.

The activities of supranational institutions and semi-public bodies over the past three years illustrate how the new totalitarian-technocratic system, the rules-based, multipolar world order of public-private partnerships, is increasingly trying to legitimize itself under constitutional law.

First and foremost, there is the World Economic Forum (WEF), which entered into a strategic partnership with the United Nations (UN) in mid-2019 in order to push ahead with the essentially authoritarian 2030 Agenda, which ultimately stands for the implementation of global socialism.

An extremely impressive (in the negative sense) Excel list of the approximately 3,800 graduates of the WEF "Young Global Leaders" program was recently published by the Malone Institute and documents the almost cult-like organization of international corporatism, whose junior leaders—as the list proves beyond doubt—are recruited largely from the alumni circle of the elite network based in Davos.

In addition to the WEF and the UN, the World Health Organization (WHO) is, of course, also currently working on contractual frameworks that expand its powers and allow the democratically illegitimate organization to override national laws and traditional participatory processes in the event of a new health emergency.

On May 10, 2022, journalist Norbert Häring reported in detail on the details of the so-called Global Pandemic Treaty, the exact design of which will be discussed at the World Health Assembly in Geneva from May 22, 2022 to May 28, 2022 and which is to enter into force by 2024 at the latest.

Meanwhile, in Basel, the Bank for International Settlements (BIS), the central bank of central banks whose employees enjoy diplomatic immunity, is discreetly tinkering with the technological infrastructure for central bank digital currencies—the death knell for the financial autonomy of ordinary citizens.

The world's most powerful and at the same time least known financial institution is primarily working on pilot projects for cross-border payment transactions so that digital francs, euros, dollars, rubles and yuan can be traded barrier-free on the markets upon the introduction of electronic money. The BIS projects Jura and mCDBC Bridge exemplify how the blockchain financial system of the near future will work.

Governments everywhere are working feverishly to abolish cash and destroy the modest wealth of a starving population—while the super-rich have been able to increase their profits exponentially in recent years, as the statistics unequivocally demonstrate. Favored by digital innovation and rarely questioned by the unreflective *Homo consumens*, the permitted amounts of cash are constantly being reduced and cash payments are successively restricted or completely prevented in many places.

France already only allows cash transactions up to a maximum value of 1,000 euros. In Italy , the limit is 2,000 euros. In Spain, you get a maximum of 2,500 euros in cash. And in Germany, when depositing at banks other than your own bank, as well as upward of an amount of 2,500 euros, you have to prove where the money comes from by means of appropriate documents.

Anonymous over-the-counter transactions with precious metals such as gold or silver are only possible in the Federal Republic of Germany up to the upper limit of 1,999 euros. Countries like Sweden are at the forefront of the transformation towards a cash-less society. The use of cash there has been declining dramatically for years, as statistics illustrate. In many shops in the capital Stockholm, cash is no longer accepted as a means of payment. This circumstance could explain why Sweden was less under pressure from the supranational oligarchy than other countries during the Covid crisis and less aggressive in terms of restrictions on freedom.

In Switzerland, the possibilities for cash payments are also steadily being reduced, even though precious metals can still be obtained anonymously in larger quantities. For example, the topic of cash recently sparked the popular anger of the inhabitants of Lucerne, where the organizing committee of the annual city festival decided to only accept card and smartphone payments

at the stands and rides of the traditional event. After a few days, due to a massive wave of complaints from the population, they pedaled back and now also offer a voucher system that allows goods and services to be paid for with physical money. It remains to be seen whether such a compromise will still be possible in the coming years.

In addition to controlling the supranational health care system and the infrastructure of the technocratic financial system, the neo-feudal caste of our time is working above all on the total surveillance of the internet.

As the White House in Washington announced on its homepage on April 28, 2022, the United States and sixty global partners recently signed a Declaration for the Future of the Internet.

The three-page declaration foreshadows the worst. Under the guise of protecting human rights and freedoms, total censorship on the World Wide Web is being advocated. Shrouded in superficial phrases, the responsibility for content control is transferred to the private sector. Vague formulations allow almost unlimited entry and access and create a sterilely curated internet of large corporations and uniform opinions, for which the state holds out the prospect of "effective oversight, and transparency, both online and offline."

This is in line with the establishment of an American Disinformation Governance Board directed from Washington, which is attached to the Department of Homeland Security and is headed by Nina Jankowicz, a convicted fraudster. Critics, such as Florida Governor Ron DeSantis, rightly call the institution a manifestation of the Orwellian Ministry of Truth. However, we need not look across the pond to realize that the metaverse reality of

tomorrow intended by the technocratic system will at best be a gloomy mélange of the oppressive visions of the future of *1984* and *Brave New World*.

The EU is also currently working at full speed on the constitution of a totalitarian construct—the "United States of Europe." A pact that will finally lead the sovereign nation state, including its at least superficially democratic processes, into irrelevance.

In a 31-page working paper from April 2022, Federico Fabbrini, professor of law at Dublin City University, outlines what the EU's leading bodies mean by post-Covid rebuild.

Under the working titles NextGenerationEU and Conference on the Future of Europe, various committees are discussing a European constitution, a deeper economic and financial union, the individual mobility of EU citizens and joint armed forces in the form of an EU army—a project that has been vehemently labelled as a hoax by officials for years and until recently. Although the preparations for a common European military have been obvious for a long time.

What Covid-19 was for the pharmaceutical industry, the Ukraine crisis is now for the military-industrial complex of Western hegemony. A steroid.

The so-called Conference on the Future of the EU, chaired by Ursula von der Leyen, published a total of 49 recommendations on April 27, 2022. Some of them make you sit up and take notice, such as passages from recommendation number 23:

"*We propose that the EU continue to act to promote dialogue and guarantee peace and a rules-based international order36,*

strengthening multilateralism and building on long standing EU peace initiatives which contributed to its award of the Nobel Prize in 2012, while strengthening its common security through. (...)

Its joint armed forces that shall be used for self-defense purposes and preclude aggressive military action of any kind, with a capacity to provide support in times of crises including natural catastrophes.

Outside European borders it could be deployed in exceptional circumstances preferably under a legal mandate from the UN Security Council and thus in compliance with international law38, and without competing with or duplicating NATO and respecting different national relationships with NATO (...) *Reflect on how to counter disinformation and propaganda in an objective and factual way*."

Strange. Two or three years ago, the idea of joint European armed forces was considered misinformation or a wild conspiracy theory. British EU critics were vilified as liars in an article in the Guardian on January 25, 2019.

Members of the British Parliament, such as Emily Thornberry, compared claims that the EU was planning its own army to the belief that Elvis Presley was still alive. In 2016, the Atlantic Council also ran the headline "The Myth of a European Army." The EU even published an article in June 2019 to dispel the myths of an EU military and emphatically denied such rumors—only to vote a few weeks ago to set up a rapid reaction force of 5,000 soldiers. Thanks to Putin.

The propagandistic calls for the EU's unified military capabilities are getting louder and louder. On April 4, 2022, the news outlet *The Defense Post* described the "endless possibilities" which

a merger of armed forces of different European countries would hold. On March 10, 2022, *The New European* also stated: "So in the end we need an EU army after all." Even the United States withdrawal from Afghanistan was already taken as an opportunity in 2021 by France 24, among others, to speak of a wake-up call for Europe and to state: "Afghanistan underlines the need for autonomous EU forces."

Although EUROCORPS has existed since 1992 as a link between the EU and NATO command, recent developments in the military field no longer necessarily give the impression that the EU is preparing exclusively for defensive scenarios.

As early as 2018, a new European Defence Coalition was launched. This was followed in the first quarter of 2021 by the establishment of the European Peace Facility—an instrument outside the regular budget, as the EU calls it, which is intended to help turn the supranational feudalist organization into a global security service provider. This doesn't necessarily sound like a purely defensive request either.

One year later, in March 2022, Strategic Compass was also launched, a military-strategic program for the long-term development of the operational capabilities of the EU armed forces. All in all, this is a rather escalating military activism for a region of the world that is primarily threatened by its own hubris, but in the foreseeable future hardly by military interventions by its neighboring countries.

In addition, of course, not only America but also the EU has declared war on the free internet. Analogous to the new US Ministry of Truth, Brussels is also working on curtailing the digital debate space. A new law against misinformation and hate

speech is in the works, as *MDR Aktuell* reported on April 23, 2022. It is intended to ensure stricter supervision of online platforms across borders. This is analogous to the controversial Network Enforcement Act, which was introduced in 2017 and whose scope of application is limited to Germany. A press release from the European Commission on May 13, 2022, entitled "Commission welcomes political agreement on new rules on cybersecurity of network and information systems" states that:

"*It streamlines reporting obligations, introduces more stringent supervisory measures for national authorities, as well as stricter enforcement requirements, and aims at harmonising sanctions regimes across Member States. It will help increase information sharing and cooperation on cyber crisis management at a national and EU level.*"

What initially sounds harmless at first glance seems to be relevant only for governments and companies turns out to be the exact opposite of improvements on closer inspection. It is the formal legitimation of comprehensive censorship. The euphemistic formulations of the EU Commission deliberately gloss over the fact that the planned regulations are now intended to grant legal certainty to the totalitarian surveillance state, thus turning injustice into justification—and this at the supranational level.

One can imagine how much influence the citizen of an EU member state will have on such centralized processes in the future—it is likely to tend towards zero.

What EU citizens can expect in the digital space in the future is exemplified by the hotly debated topic of "chat control." The members of the European Parliament already adopted a corresponding

ordinance on July 6, 2021. On May 11, 2022, the European Commission presented a follow-up regulation to the now mandatory use of chat control by all providers.

Patrick Breyer, MEP of the Pirate Party and self-proclaimed "digital freedom fighter," has analyzed this follow-up regulation in detail and explicitly sets out on his homepage the drastic consequences of accepting the totalitarian proposal. He writes:

"*The EU Commission proposes to oblige providers to search all private chats, messages, and emails automatically for suspicious content – generally and indiscriminately. The stated aim: To prosecute child sexual exploitation material (CSEM). The result: Mass surveillance by means of fully automated real-time surveillance of messaging and chats and the end of privacy of digital correspondence.*
Other aspects of the proposal include ineffective network blocking, screening of personal cloud storage including private photos, mandatory age verification resulting in the end of anonymous communication, appstore censorship and excluding minors from the digital world."

Commenting on the fatal consequences of the new regulation for data protection and civil society as such, he continues:

"*Texts, images, videos and voice can be searched. The providers are obliged to search messages on each smartphone (client-side scanning) and, if necessary, reject them unencrypted. This destroys trust in secure encryption and forces a backdoor that enables the monitoring of previously securely encrypted communications for many other purposes as well.*
Personal storage that isn't shared, like Apple's iCloud, is also affected. Since presumably every service is also used for illegal purposes, all

services are obliged to monitor chats. (...) The machine-based search for unknown depictions of abuse is an experimental procedure using machine learning (artificial intelligence).
The algorithms are not accessible to the public or science, and the draft does not contain any disclosure obligation. The error rate is unknown and is not limited by the draft regulation, presumably leading to mass false positives. The draft allows providers to pass on hit reports to the police without checking them."

What this reveals is, firstly, that Mussolini was right. And secondly, that the image of the small conspiratorial lodge that secretly strives for world domination is a media phantom. A straw man. The illegal machinations and conspiracies of neo-feudal castes take place in public. Not in smoky salons, rite halls, Masonic temples or other enclaves of the wealthy.

The criminal acts are hidden in convoluted ordinances, complicated legal texts, commercial contracts, statutes, strategy papers, parliamentary minutes, memos, stacks of files, press releases and on confusing websites of non-transparent organizations. Crime scenes include courthouses, corporate headquarters, meeting rooms, luxury hotels and restaurants, plenary halls, offices, television studios and editorial offices.

Perpetrators and frontmen of the corresponding criminal organizations appear on prime-time television. They unabashedly portray themselves as approachable representatives of the people, diligent scientists, generous philanthropists or self-sacrificing altruists.

The trick here is to create a structural complexity in the system that allows communication to be encoded and responsibility for questionable processes to be constantly passed

on from one party to the next, so that ultimately no one can be held liable.

That is, of course, if anyone even asks critical questions. Because tomorrow the media charade will deflect from the topic and divert our attention to something new—which the people, consumed by their everyday life and crises, generally cannot help but resist.

Jean-Claude Juncker, former President of the European Commission, said in the *Spiegel* issue of December 27, 1999 shamelessly and aptly:

"*We decide on something, and then put it in the room and wait for some time to see what happens. If there is no great outcry and no riots, because most people do not understand what has been decided, then we will continue—step by step until there is no turning back.*"

The organized crime of the ruling class, which has lived for centuries at the expense of a hard-working majority, has legitimized itself in the representative democracy of late modernity and has been constituted internationally through supranational organizations that completely elude democratic processes. The fabled New World Order has long been a reality.

We are dealing with the corporatist-totalitarian rule of criminal financial elites, oligarchs, technocrats and eugenicists. And elections won't change that, although a critical mass of enlightened people may. Nick Hanauer, one of the richest 0.01 percent of the US population, co-founder of Amazon and pugnacious critic of capitalism, wrote in an open letter to his "fellow filthy rich Americans" in 2014:

"And also like you, I have been rewarded obscenely for my success, with a life that the other 99.99 percent of Americans can't even imagine. (…) But let's speak frankly to each other. (…) Seeing where things are headed is the essence of entrepreneurship. And what do I see in our future now? I see pitchforks."

May 15, 2022

Collective Self-destruction

The WHO is preparing to disempower nation states by means of a global pandemic agreement. Europe is sacrificing itself for the sake of NATO hegemony. *Homo sapiens* is surrendering to transhumanism and gradually abolishing itself. Why—lack of knowledge, ignorance, social Stockholm syndrome or a tendency to auto-aggression?

Auto-aggression, or self-injurious behavior, is defined as voluntary, direct destruction or alteration of body tissues without suicidal intentions.

At the same time, this description is an excellent metaphor to describe the behavior of a considerable percentage of the population that seems to have fallen victim to a certain tendency to self-mutilation since the beginning of the Covid crisis and the appearance of health apostles who feign omnipotence.

It seems as if an epiphany has struck the group in question. Because the willingness to sacrifice for the collective, for the greater good decreed from above, for Ukraine, the last generation and other official narratives that have prevailed since that disruptive moment is now taking on forms reminiscent of masochism.

As if it weren't enough that the population has been subjecting itself for more than two years to a state-imposed hygiene training that combines totalitarian lockdowns, vaccination campaigns and contradictory health protection measures with elements of apartheid. But now a large part of the population is obviously also willing to risk the mostly modest or bourgeois prosperity for a proxy conflict between the United States and the eternal class enemy Russia.

In the worst case, this my even lead to a world war or nuclear war. At least that's what official polls say. In these times of media dogmatism, however, their significance remains to be seen.

Nevertheless, an astonishing number of people who until a few weeks ago were still in mortal fear because of a minimally lethal virus are suddenly willing to give their belongings and lives—for a demonstrably corrupt clan regime in Kiev dictated by right-wing extremists and financed by the United States. It is hard to imagine more intellectual self-mutilation. Corrupt despots are not only in Moscow but also in Washington, Berlin, London, Brussels, Paris, Canberra and Geneva.

In stoic ignorance of the fact that the United States is permanently involved in various wars of aggression in violation of international law and has been deliberately destabilizing the Arab region and South America for decades to enforce hegemonic economic interests, Europe continues to show unconditional solidarity and is throwing billions of tax dollars not only at the arms industry.

The reasoning of these transatlanticists who are loyal to the party line is that Russia is much worse, that Putin is even more corrupt, a demon, so to speak, and that his extremists are even more extremist. Hence, ideology triumphs above reason. And objection to this frenzy is futile.

To be against the former Soviet Union and everything Russian is now "good racism," for the collective. People are believing themselves to be on the right side of history. As a result, some of them are willing to help to the point of self-abandonment—and to pay.

Almost manically, today's woke do-gooder supports every narrative that the sovereign criers declare to be the topic of the day, fed to them in the morning in the form of newspaper articles, social media posts or online tracts. They swallow whatever comes their way without objections, questioning or reflection.

Since the beginning of the Covid crisis, an alarming number of people have completely lacked individual morals and value systems. Enlightenment and humanism seem to be a relic of the past. Most resign to "assisted thinking" and merge with the mass of do-gooders regardless of all facts and cognitive dissonances. For someone who claims to be a democrat, such behavior is a declaration of bankruptcy. And for a journalist it would be too, of course. The writing guild, in particular, should be following the principle of questioning everything as a matter of course. This includes, above all, the government, as well as oneself.

The silent acceptance and ignorance of technocratic totalitarianism that prevails in large parts of Western societies is oppressive. The history lessons of the past decades have obviously been fruitless. His teachings have fizzled out.

The militarization of language, the approval of war while at the same time negating any geopolitical or historical context—and this exclusively to one's own detriment—can hardly be justified in any other way than masochism, self-denial or even complicity.

Under certain circumstances, society as a whole may also be suffering from Stockholm syndrome, a collective, media-induced psychosis. This would explain why people who are lied to by corrupt top politicians in electoral cycles over and over again—often even repeatedly by the same ones—nevertheless go to the polls again and again to choose between plague and cholera. As a result of their vote, they are legitimizing a sick system that patronizes, robs, dispossesses, exploits, manipulates and ridicules them.

The system's singular task is to sustain itself to redistribute wealth and power, from the bottom up. It is a financial perpetual motion machine of aristocracy and capital that has been spinning for generations. History does not repeat itself in this respect but shows an oppressive constancy over centuries. However, with the final empowerment of supranational institutions such as the WHO, whose current concepts cannot be described in any other way, neo-feudal conditions are reaching unprecedented proportions.

While national elections have long been a farce; however, now they are degenerating into a sleazy comedy with the prospect of the adoption of a new, internationally binding treaty of the WHO to combat the pandemic in the almost 200 member states.

No enlightened democrat who has taken a look at the official draft of the WHO's pandemic treaty as of May 3, 2022, the so-called "Zero Draft," can support it with a clear conscience.

The project resembles a coup, a global empowerment for fascistic arbitrariness and the abolition of national sovereignty—and thus of free civil society. It is initiated by an organization that is dependent on large private investors and eludes any participatory process. Even if the WHO's current "Zero Draft" is not yet

a completely new treaty text, not a big hit, but rather an extension of the existing pandemic regulations, the content is still off-putting enough for liberal-minded contemporaries.

That's why the corresponding paper on the confusing website of the WHO is probably difficult to locate. And the mainstream media are also diligently sweeping the topic under the carpet at the moment. It is only ZDF that has mentioned it, albeit relativizing it in an intellectually flat fig-leaf article from May 19, 2022 entitled (translated) "WHO Pandemic Treaty—No End to Democracy."

By contrast, the author Karen Harradine had already published a detailed article on the financial background of the WHO on March 14, 2022. In it, she writes about the monetary dependencies of the World Health Organization:

"*The GF* [Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation] *is one of the largest funders of the WHO, making its first donation to the organisation in 1998, and becoming its official partner in 2017; the only no n-country to do so. In 2020, the GF gave the WHO $592,277, making it the second largest funder that year. This is small change for the GF, a sweetener to ensure that the WHO promotes its vaccine investments. Its subsidiary, GAVI, and its Covid-19 vaccine project, the Access to COVID-19 Tools (ACT) Accelerator, monopolise the WHO. ACT is also spearheaded by the WHO, GF, Gavi, and the Wellcome Trust, with the latter a vaccine initiative. No wonder the WHO promotes unreliable Covid-19 tests and experimental vaccines."*

The fact that the WHO does not have altruistic motives in the foreground should be clear to anyone who has studied the composition of the organization. I have already reported in detail on GAVI and the eugenically motivated activities of the too-little-known Wellcome Trust in my article on bioethics of February 27, 2022. An analysis of

the new WHO document, however, shows that the next step for the corporatist oligarchy is no longer "just" about corruption, enrichment and monopolization of markets, but about the creeping but final abolition of national sovereignty. And about power over *Homo sapiens* itself, its body and the genes of the herd—because that's how ordinary people are called, for example, behind the chic glass facades of the City of London—as livestock. It is sufficient to briefly check which terms appear most frequently in the new WHO document in order to get an impression of its basic intentions: Vaccination 33 times. Surveillance 30 times. Misinformation 7 times. Privacy 5 times.

On the other hand, you don't read anything about health, prophylaxis, strengthening the immune system, a healthy lifestyle, sports, nutrition and mindfulness. It is about political leadership, international cooperation and collaboration, financing, sustainable market development in the field of mRNA injections and global surveillance of the population.

Thus, the 75th World Health Assembly in Geneva from May 22, 2022 to May 28, 2022 is preparing to use this agreement to lay the foundation for a biofascist command construct legitimized by constitutional law, a supranational organizational model against which it is almost impossible to rebel once it has been instituted by "democratic" means.

Once the new regulations come into force, the WHO would be empowered to impose global vaccination mandates, restrict the individual mobility of billions of people, or impose local lockdowns and curfews in extreme cases and with the application of sanctions against member states.

This makes it abundantly clear that any government official who signs this totalitarian WHO paper is prepared to commit political

suicide, sacrifice democracy and betray the country for which he was supposed to commit himself as a representative of the people according to his electoral mandate, in order to hand it over to an international, corporatist oligarchy.

However, the civilizational kamikaze course is increasingly breaking ground elsewhere as well. It is not enough that traditional systems of values and communication have been reduced to absurdity by the Covid crisis. Or that the WHO and other supranational organizations now want to put the concept of free societies to rest once and for all.

Even the war in Ukraine and the accompanying dismantling of peace policy, the abandonment of humanistic, pacifist morals and open racism against everything Russian do not yet represent the freestyle of destructive developments.

For modern *Homo sapiens* is apparently also ready to accept the end of itself. He is increasingly becoming a slave to his innovations, a victim of technology and pharmacology, whose functioning and efficiencies he is less and less able to comprehend, assess and control. In this way, science has replaced religion as a reservoir for the disoriented. The polished results of supposed technological progress serve as transhumanist idols.

Proponents of the Fourth Industrial Revolution, such as the WEF-affiliated history professor Yuval Noah Harari or Dennis M. Bushnell, who has been NASA's chief scientist since the Gemini programs, make no secret of the fact that the future will not be dominated by *Homo sapiens*.

A corresponding lecture by Harari for the WEF in January 2018 illustrates where the journey is heading at the discretion of the

technocratic caste. Like Henry Kissinger before him, he likes to describe mankind as a "useless eater" and would like to wipe it off the face of the planet as soon as it no longer serves the economic system, preferably yesterday rather than today.

And Dennis M. Bushnell also unabashedly advocates the abolition of human beings. A 113-page presentation by the NASA scientist from 2001 illustrates what the American space agency is actually working on. While the general public associates these four world-famous letters primarily with space shuttles, heroically staged astronauts and the undiscovered expanses of space, the US space agency, which Hitler's engineers played a major role in building, devotes about 80 percent of its resources to work on military projects.

It's hardly surprising that Bushnell's 2001 presentation is titled "Future Strategic Issues/Future Warfare, Circa 2025."

Although the authenticity of the presentation has been questioned several times in recent years, Dennis M. Bushnell's Wikipedia entry does refer to the publication. Another document likewise suggests that it is Bushnell's original presentation to NASA. The validation document comes from Dartmouth College, Institute for Security Technology and Society and was published in January 2001 by Joseph Rosen and Charles Lucey. On page 372, there is a reference to Dennis Bushnell's NASA lecture. Moreover, you only have to listen to one of the man's lectures available on the internet to know that the presentation—even if it seems more than grotesque—is dedicated to the very topics on which the transhumanist works in the service of the United States military.

However, his NASA lecture is particularly remarkable because it is already more than twenty years old yet already accurately

addressed those developments that challenge or threaten us today. In 2001, the US space agency was either very well informed, analytical and far-sighted—or actively involved in the realization of the more than gloomy plans. The latter is more likely. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration, like DARPA (Defense Advance Research Projects) and countless other US government agencies, is primarily an enterprise of the military-industrial complex. The friendly starship Enterprise image of "Cape Canaveral" is deceiving.

At the beginning of his presentation, Dennis Bushnell compares the Earth to a spaceship hurtling through space, and its crew is civilization. And the crew is rapidly destroying its habitat.

Overexploitation of nature, climate change, overpopulation and the ability of the crew to control its own evolution by genetic manipulation now threaten the existence of humanity. That's the plot. On page nine of his 131 slides, he speaks of transhumanism, mentions Hans Moravec, a pioneer of inhumane ideology, who in his book *Mind Children* predicted the fusion of man and machine as early as 1990, and who has from then on advocated for the abolition of *Homo sapiens* as we know it today.

Still on page nine, the NASA researcher talks about "cross species molecular breeding," about controlled evolution, and refers to MAXYGEN, a discrete US research institution that deals with "synthetic biology" and the "optimization of controlled evolution." This sounds alarmingly like fantasies of omnipotence by scientists who want to play God, and like eugenics. From Dennis Bushnell's perspective, however, this is only logical.

On page twelve of his slide battle, he categorizes the technological epochs of civilization's development in tabular form. He begins

with the hunter-gatherers. After the nomads settled down, had mastered agriculture and gone through a first industrial revolution, Bushnell predicted more than two decades ago that information technology would dominate the period between 1950 and 2020, but that the year 2020 would mark the dawn of the era of biotechnology and nanotechnology. This is closely followed by the final developmental step of the human being—a dissolution in virtuality.

The fact that Bushnell and company are working feverishly to overcome this last evolutionary stage is also shown by a disturbing lecture by the scientist from 2018.

The NASA veteran talks about the genetic optimization of children before birth, of self-sufficient, replicating nano-bots, living factories for genetic products, the optimization of the human body through mechanics and processors, about the doubling of lifespan, the digital brain, the reciprocal connection of the human brain with the computer and—in the final step—the upload of the entire human consciousness to the cloud.

Anyone who regards these visions of technological singularity as dystopia will find the remaining hundred pages of the NASA document no less oppressive. For from page 15 onwards, Bushnell predicts the hostile takeover, the assimilation of the human race by the machine. At first imperceptibly, as its users and operators, then as its compliant mass, as junkies, dependent on the digital companions of life—that's how far we've come—until *Homo sapiens* will finally become the defenseless victim of its innovation and physically merged with it.

Bushnell talks about virtual spaces in which people will work in the future, holodecks, nano dust, neuro-informatics, the "US Human Brain Project" of the 1990s and machine creativity.

Nowadays, by the way, the US government is researching the matter under the label BRAIN Initiative, which was founded in 2013 by the Obama administration. In the same year, the European Union also founded a counterpart, the Human Brain Project, which is based in Geneva. The European Human Brain Project and the European Commission are partners of the International Neuroinformatics Coordinating Facility (INCF), which was founded in 2005 and is based in Stockholm. So, the developments predicted by Bushnell are in full swing.

Furthermore, as early as 2001, the United States researcher spoke of "*cost-effective, motivating, asynchronous, web-based distance learning*" and predicted that around 2025 about 40 percent of private and 15 percent of public schools will close, as classes will increasingly take place online.

This technological development supports the "*decline of the US underclass, a stabilization of the world's population through an isolated way of life, a balance between the wealthy and the have-nots, and changed international prospects for the military*." The wording speaks for itself.

His ideal of education, the ultimate solution, as Bushnell calls it, is a "plug and play" approach—a dedicated line to the brain through which knowledge is uploaded directly from the computer. This is somewhat reminiscent of Neuralink, the company of Elon Musk. Musk works closely with the United States military and American intelligence services, and launches CIA satellites into space.

From page 27 onwards, Bushnell then deals with topics such as terraforming and geoengineering, the exploitation of "wastelands" such as the Sahara, artificial food and social problems. However, the German army (Bundeswehr), for example, is also thinking

intensively about geoengineering, as evidenced by a 48-page document from the "Future Analysis Department" from November 2012.

But what is most interesting is what forms of crime NASA expects in the future of 2025. In addition to problems with data protection and privacy due to omnipresent micro- and nano-sensors, Bushnell and his team expect biocrime, virus and gene attacks, the theft of implants, other extensions of *Homo sapiens*, as well as psychosomatic waves of disease and massive social unrest. To his credit, on page 31, the NASA scientist does briefly warn against self-replicating robots, nano-replicators or uncontrollable recombinants. But after that, however, the prediction of a multipolar world order and binary bioweapons continues unabated. That vision includes a "bio-revolution," understood as, among other things, the breeding of animals or their extremities in the laboratory for food production. He announces that spider genes in goats will make it possible to produce modified spider silk from goat's milk—which will allow for the production of so-called "bio-steel," which, when processed into a bulletproof vest, offers better protection than conventional materials such as Kevlar. Sounds fantastic, but it's actually been in the works for a long time, as various articles from over a decade ago prove.

As early as 2001, Dennis M. Bushnell insinuates on slide 41 that "hijacked insects" are supposed to perform certain environmental genetic tasks, fight undesirable species, or even apply vaccines. A sinister intervention in the fragile balance of an inherently perfect planet, which has also long since become reality, as the *New York Post* confirms in an article on March 9, 2022.

After that, it's about swarms of sensors, nano-tags that are to be placed on everything and everyone in the future, and "mechanical micro dust" as a new bioweapon. Such dust could, for

example, attack the lungs with various pathogens after inhalation, depending on the programming.

In the following pages, Bushnell writes about “interesting, obviously legal” scenarios of warfare: information warfare, psychological warfare, high- and low-frequency weapons, and their effects on human brain cells. He points out the efficiencies and potential lethality of such weapon systems, talks about sonic weapons, chemical weapons and the secret manipulation of humans via artificially generated sensory stimuli—methods that are mainly used against an enemy within.

But the NASA man also talks about the large calibers. He provides updates on the latest developments in alternatives to the atomic bomb, raves about new transatlantic missile systems, advanced cruise missiles, optimized nuclear weapons or pressure wave accelerators. And he points out that warfare must be more inconspicuous in the future.

Bushnell describes how the process of warfare must move from the military-industrial complex to the commercial sector in order to eventually reach civil society. This socio-architectural artifice increases people’s acceptance of military operations of the future, even if they are directed against parts of their own population.

Yet, the NASA employee had written humans off as degenerate anyway. On page 66, he describes the limitations of *Homo sapiens* in the year 2025 with the adjectives big, heavy, wistful and slow (physically and psychologically). Bushnell criticizes the fact that modern man causes too much effort in the preservation of himself and attests to the Earth’s inhabitant a “rapidly decreasing to negative surplus value.” That is why he advocates its rapid programmatic decimation.

Thus, the US scientist continues to fantasize uninhibitedly about non-explosive war, asynchronous warfare, autonomous military operations, drone warfare, unconventional warfare, state terrorism, social disruption, genetic warfare, plants and animals that are covertly used as weapons by injecting them with warfare agents. These agents could then be distributed by rats in large cities or by flowers via their pollen. He points out that natural explosive power can be used to create chaos and disrupt supply chains. For example, in the form of blowing up dams, critical infrastructure or nuclear reactors, which, when destroyed, unleash forces that far exceed the amount of energy used.

Bushnell also seems enthusiastic about the idea of being able to use natural disasters as a weapon in the future. Unfortunately, even this is no longer science fiction. After all, it is not only in the United States that people have been actively working on weather manipulation since the 1950s. In 1953, the Advisory Committee on Weather Control was established in America, the final report of which was published at the end of 1957.

However, this was only the beginning of serious military research in this field, as Professor Michel Chossudovsky confirms in an article on "Weather Warfare" published on December 7, 2007. He refers, among other things, to a 1996 US Air Force document that states that the US will have the weather under control as a weapon by 2025.

The state of Texas, like many others, still maintains an official Weather Modification Advisory Committee. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) documents weather modification projects and their activities in the United States. And China already employs 37,000 full-time employees in the field of weather manipulation. The best known in this context today is probably the HAARP project, which is blamed for weather

phenomena, tsunamis, earthquakes and other events. Although hard to prove, if one analyzes what the targeted manipulation of the ionosphere can theoretically achieve, these scenarios cannot be completely dismissed. One thing is certain: the delicate balance of terrestrial, meteorological, biological or evolutionary processes is no more sacred to the neo-feudalists than human DNA is when it comes to asserting claims to power.

Thus, with his presentation from 2001, the scientist cultivates the image of an America of the year 2025 that is primarily characterized by wars—by wars of aggression. And these are no longer only directed against enemies from outside but above all against their own population. Against everything and everyone.

In this context, it is significant that when it comes to war, Dennis Bushnell often speaks of "inexpensive Trojan horse civilian systems." By this he means, among other things, social media platforms through which information warfare is supposed to take place. Or pharmacological processes that ostensibly serve humane purposes but perform other tasks, as civilian systems of the US military.

This focus on social and genetic manipulation may explain why the large big tech corporations usually owe their seed capital to the military-industrial complex, directly or indirectly—be it Alphabet (Google), Facebook, Amazon or Twitter—or why DARPA invested heavily in the development of mRNA vaccines as a platform technology long before the Covid crisis, and why a company like Moderna through its covert made financing possible in the first place.

In addition, the phrase "low-cost, civilian systems" echoes the aforementioned strategic approach of the United States, outlined

by Dennis Bushnell, and thus the Anglo-American hegemony of wanting to transfer warfare from the purely military sector to the commercial and ultimately civilian sector.

A look at the geopolitical, sociological and economic state of the world in 2022 gives every reason to believe that the NASA researcher's clients appreciated his suggestions and are already successfully implementing many of them. The rest of the "advances" from military, genetic and secret laboratories can probably be expected in the coming years. For example, the WHO pandemic treaty, which was positively received by the G7 health ministers in Berlin on May 20, 2022, is certainly a serious threat to liberally organized civil society. However, the activities of research institutions such as NASA, DARPA, the Wellcome Trust, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, the Rockefeller or Carnegie Foundation—to name only the most well-known—are a direct attack on human existence and thus incomparably more dangerous.

Transhumanism and bioethics, according to Yuval Harari, are the modern substitutes for religion—and nothing more than euphemisms for eugenic ideas that have never lost momentum for over a century. They have only disappeared from public perception, as my article from March 5, 2022, already explains. The technocrats are concerned with population control and reduction, euthanasia and the controlled breeding of human beings. Canada and the United States are leading the way with corresponding new laws.

Therefore, if *Homo sapiens* can still muster a little self-esteem and respect for evolution, it should take its hand off the metaphorical self-destruct button right now and cut off the power supply to the technocratic-transhumanist machine.

Dennis M. Bushnell may be an inconspicuous man away from the limelight. But he is a thought leader in his field, unscrupulous about the consequences of his work, and has been in his position since the 1960s. He stands for the fascistic agenda of his neo-feudal technocrat caste like hardly any other publicly speaking representative of this school of thought. And he embodies what is commonly referred to as the Deep State—or the Continuity of Government—that is, the true servants of the flag, chief ideologues, secretaries of state and functionaries who hold their positions even when the political actors in the front row are replaced every few years, switch places or have to serve as pawns for unpopular decisions.

In this way, the system ensures that concepts, strategies and scenarios that sounded like dreams of the future or were considered too controversial twenty years ago will become a grim reality over time—regardless of which party is currently in power or dominating the headlines.

After all, the technocratic system is constantly calibrating itself through crises and supposed chaos.

With every state of emergency, it shifts red lines, takes steps without alternative and makes the unthinkable conceivable. It is therefore hardly surprising that just before the start of the WEF meeting on May 22, 2022 and the WHO meeting in Geneva, monkeypox was going viral—in the leading media, mind you—and already had a detailed Wikipedia entry that documented 85 suspected cases for Spain and Portugal together on May 21, 2022.

Now that the Covid panic has noticeably subsided, the Ukraine narrative is full of holes and the warmongering seems more than compulsive, a new global health risk would certainly be

convenient for those in power to legitimize the supranational WHO coup in Geneva at the end of May.

It is probably pure coincidence that the NTI (Nuclear Threat Initiative) and the Munich Security Conference simulated the outbreak of a smallpox pandemic as early as March 2021 and that Bill Gates has been warning of it ever since—or that the health ministers of the G7 countries drilled the outbreak of the same pathogen in Berlin a few days ago. How convenient that the American FDA (Food and Drug Association) announced the approval of a corresponding vaccination against smallpox on May 19, 2022.

In the meantime, the totalitarian technocrats and financial elites have at least noticed that they have lost the trust of the population.

That's why they're working flat out on the grand narrative. And this is probably one of the reasons why, according to the preliminary agenda , the topic of "rebuilding social trust" is being addressed in Davos on the very first day—to enable the few to continue to reshape the world undisturbed according to their dystopian visions and to the detriment of the many.

However, this is now likely to be a difficult undertaking. Because trust in the system has almost certainly eroded more than one is led to believe on the basis of questionable surveys. Which doesn't necessarily bode well—because if manipulation doesn't work, they'll try more brutal methods.

May 22, 2022

Green – The New Brown

"If you vote for the Greens, you will reproach yourself bitterly later on." (Helmut Schmidt)

Green is the new brown. In the meantime, even the most politically disenchanted contemporary should have noticed this. It is no coincidence that the German Green Party has been dubbed the "prohibition party." After all, as a permanent opposition party, they could afford to make abstruse proposals that would clearly never be implemented. The latter also helped appease the radical wings of the party, which were fed by the left-wing radical protest movements of the 1970s and 1980s.

But since the Greens have arrived in the federal government and are allowed to indulge uninhibitedly in their misguided do-gooderism, the motto is: free fall into chaos. The only constant is the raised index finger. Thus, the paternalistic habitus of the party in government reaches completely new dimensions. Now it is no longer just abstruse proposals and symbolic-political bans and proscriptions hat characterize the program of the supposedly pacifist hippies. Instead, their increase in power is now also exposing the dogmatic character of the green ideologues more and more clearly. Supported by wokeness, cancel culture and ANTIFA, the Greens are instigating a new version of the Cultural Revolution.

"If thought corrupts language, then language corrupts thought." (George Orwell)

Even during the peak phase of the Covid crisis, Green cadre officials, such as Baden-Württemberg's Prime Minister Kretschmann or Tübingen Mayor Boris Palmer, attracted attention above all by presenting particularly fascistic proposals for controlling the supposed pandemic. Segregation and open defamation of individual population groups were regarded as effective means of crisis management, as was the creeping perforation of inalienable fundamental rights. Even their temporary to permanent restriction or abolition was no longer a red line.

Thanks to Covid-19, it has become clearer than ever that the Greens are no longer just the old "prohibition party" that wants to push through its agenda within the framework of democratic guardrails. Indeed, the modern Maoists are now also prepared to sacrifice all the stabilizing guardrails of the liberal social order to their interventionist ideology.

For the party stands for four things above all: collectivism, centralism, corporatism and totalitarianism. Translated into political systematics, this is synonymous with socialism—an authoritarian socialism, and a social Darwinism. The latter is now referred to by many party members as "democratic socialism," a euphemistic embellishment that does not change the essence of the matter.

Ultimately, socialism always stands for the devaluation, anonymization and equalization of the individual in favor of a collective. Your own life counts for nothing. The community, on the other hand, which is protected by the state, is everything. An ideology that may sound tempting here and there, in theory, but in practice is simply out of touch with reality. Because even if it's true that wealth is more evenly distributed under socialism, that doesn't mean that everyone is equally well off—it means that everyone is equally poor.

Moreover, socialism has more lives on its conscience than any other ideologically driven form of society. History shows that. After all, the system can hardly do without violence. In order to gain an initial foothold, it must identify and exclude—or eradicate—critics and dissenters. It relies heavily on propaganda. Therefore, the system must create an enemy for itself. A race, a religion, a country, a virus, an unpleasant population group or a vile dictator—who supposedly threatens the collective existentially. So, it gathers around the flag. As a result, it always means war, be it inwards or outwards, or both. The amplitude of the social earthquake may fluctuate, but a socialist system has never been introduced without bloody clashes and the military.

First of all, therefore, the establishment of the social model costs human lives. Afterwards, its centralization and the scarcity economy as well as the struggle of any internal opposition force to resist both concepts costs lives. And when the system collapses, due to its inherent flaws, masses of people usually die again, as was the case in China. To date, Mao Zedong is considered the undisputed greatest mass murderer in history.

> **"To adopt an ideology is always to inherit its inheritance of unresolved contradictions." (George Orwell)**

And when it came to bloodshed, as in Cuba, for example, the dream of equality for the masses quickly ended in abject poverty for the masses—usually in favor of an elite caste of functionaries or the military. I traveled to Cuba myself for several weeks in 2018 to get an idea of the situation in the country. Unfortunately, there is rarely any trace of the socialist Che Guevara romanticism that is often peddled in the West.

Most Cubans suffer from massive poverty, broken infrastructure and supply bottlenecks. In addition, they are often afraid to express their opinions openly, depending on how strict the party-loyal block warden is in every neighborhood.

In the home of the legendary Havana cigars, no local still flirts with socialist ideals. Bitter reality has long since buried the lofty visions. From an economic point of view, state interventionism has never been crowned with success in the history of modern civilization. Every attempt at a centrally planned economy has failed miserably. You can't just design a society on the drawing board. Cuba shows this more than clearly. In addition, nowadays people like to suppress the fact that Adolf Hitler was also initially a socialist. "Nazi" is short for National Socialist. At the core, the socialist program greatly resembles the radical ideology of the Greens today. Only the collectivist image of the enemy and his actions differ from those of the mass-murdering dictator.

Today, people no longer attack Jews and non-Aryans, but categorically exclude everything that does not correspond to their own worldview by means of cancel culture and uniform opinion. People are destroyed socially, politically and economically, their reputations are destroyed, or they are put in the digital pillory. And if you listen to one or the other top Green politician, you can hardly avoid the impression that some comrades could be trusted to set up camps and shoot enemies of the people without solidarity, even today.

Not only since Joschka Fischer and the Kosovo war, but the realpolitik of the Greens has also stood for the opposite of the party's altruistic, ecological and humanitarian advertising slogans. When the noble goals of the Green dogmatists come into contact with the reality of life, they quickly subordinate themselves to the

arrogant striving for power of the well-to-do party leadership and the reflexive nonchalance of their often affluent clientele.

Therefore, Robert Habeck probably sees no contradiction in now supporting nuclear power and coal-fired power plants due to the sanctions against Russia. And according to his own statements, the political actor is not afraid of the Third World War either. The fact that the party once defined itself by the fight for the nuclear phase-out or the withdrawal from NATO obviously no longer plays a role today. Now the highest priority is to enforce the Pax-Americana against Russia by all means as a vicarious agent of the United States.

Thus, not only does the theoretical construct of the Greens demonstrably stand on feet of clay, but the party's realpolitik program is also subject to serious misconceptions. In many respects, it is simply infantile and illusory. An empty vessel.

This may be due to the lack of competence of the management staff, or to simple delusion. As a rule, the Greens—like all other parties in the German Bundestag—represent positions of US hegemony and fight for narratives that are imposed on them by US think tanks, NGOs, foundations and philanthropists as well as a coordinated scientific establishment. Only the AfD deviates here and there and actually seems to pursue its own or other interests, but fails to move anything in parliament due to a lack of majorities.

The Greens, however, have no goals and intrinsic motivations of their own, no relation to their actual environment and the reality of life of hard-working people. The party is a vassal of a corporatist elite. And it will implement the United Nations' technocratic-socialist 2030 Agenda more radically than anyone else. This starts with geopolitical questions and ends with the

postulated climate apocalypse, which is primarily based on the assumption that the average temperature of the planet is rising increasingly sharply.

The fact that the relevant reference figures in the ivory tower of the natural sciences have been artificially calculated upwards for years, allowing them to depict the temperature increase more dramatically by means of modified data, is ignored by Habeck, Baerbock, Özdemir or Goering-Eckhardt just as assiduously as Fischer, Trittin, Künast, Ströbele and others before them. Maybe they are even aware of it.

However, since those in power are dependent on the threatening backdrop of man-made doomsday for the enforcement of their agenda, they avoid facts in this regard just as successfully as with regard to the actual Covid deaths or massive mRNA vaccination side effects.

So instead of worrying about the increasing pollution of the world's oceans, the destruction of the rainforest, the overexploitation of nature or the extinction of species, they defend ideological positions to enforce their own agenda by hook or by crook. Thus, while countless private jets of the corporate and political oligarchy fly to climate conferences, the rainforest burns, oil is dumped into the seas in front of plastic islands, new cruise ships are built, over one hundred animal species become extinct every day, and Formula 1 makes its rounds senselessly, the Greens call on the average citizen to turn down the heating, drive slower, eat less meat or shorten their daily showers. All to save the world and defeat Vladimir Putin.

Anyone who argues that the West is harming itself above all with the sanctions must expect headwinds from the dark Green

collective. Even if the development of the Russian ruble since the beginning of Western sanctions speaks for itself. Yesterday's Covid denier is today's Putin sympathizer. If one exposes the fanatical Green in its erroneous belief and refutes manslaughter arguments with facts, the party often reacts just as indignantly and personally defamatory as it always accuses its opponents of being.

Often you can feel the sheer hatred against those who think differently. In such cases, Cem Özdemir also likes to become vulgar, not to say antisocial, even telling critical passers-by to "shut up."

Especially exhausting and insulting to the intelligence of any normal person is the woke-green youth. The currently most prominent representative of the same, Emilia Fester, has already triggered a shitstorm with her first Bundestag speech in March 2022. In her appearance, which makes you feel embarrassed for the dilettante actor, the 24-year-old MP portrayed herself as a pitiful victim of a society that is absolutely incapable of introducing a general obligation to vaccinate. However, this is urgently needed so that Ms. Fester "can finally go back to university, the club or vacation."

Quite apart from her grotesque presentation, the argument is not only absolutely wrong in view of the IFR (Infection Fatality Rate) of Covid-19 and the questionable efficiencies of the mRNA injections, but also simply selfish—although selfishness is exactly the behavior that the critics of the compulsory vaccination campaigns are repeatedly accused of.

They think only of themselves and their freedom. However, Green pharmaceutical lobbyists cannot be stopped by such cognitive dissonances and contradictions, as the sociophobic Janosch Dahmen, whose only political mandate seems to be the introduction of compulsory vaccination, continuously demonstrates.

In addition, contrary to her statements during the Bundestag speech, Fräulein Fester was apparently on vacation during the course of the pandemic, as an Instagram post by the young dogmatist from July 2020 suggests. And she didn't have to go to university at all. After all, she never studied—which in turn explains why she never sat in a lecture hall during the Covid crisis.

These are brazen lies in order to be able to take on an argumentative victim role. Ideology triumphs truth. Emilia Fester is in her mid-twenties and receives a five-figure monthly salary from tax revenues for her work as a member of the Bundestag. In addition, after a mere two years of service in parliament, she receives various additional benefits and is entitled to an outrageously high (compared to that of the working population) pension.

Nevertheless, in a recent interview with *SPIEGEL*, she had the audacity to speak again of sacrificing her youth. On May 13, 2022, Roland Tichy aptly headlined: "I am a victim, therefore I am." And this by no means only applies to Ms. Fester in the case of the Greens. A large part of the heated gender debate is based on such subjective victim positions—rather than on facts, a real social need or democratic opinion-forming processes.

A glance at the results of Ms. Fester's highly remunerated work raises well-founded doubts about the story of suffering of the young Greens—because these consist primarily of infantile dance videos, which she recorded with her colleagues from the party's youth department and then spread in a good mood on social media portals.

Not that the videos convey political content or have any claim—they are simply meaningless and embarrassing dance videos of affluent late pubescent children without professional or life

experience, which must seem like sheer mockery to every financially starving, hard-working taxpayer.

This is compounded by the fact that the Bundestag—as already the largest parliament in the pseudo-democratic world—continues to grow, treating itself to an additional 79 employees and paying MPs 300 euros more per month from July 2022.

A constant comrade-in-arms in the parliamentary dance interludes of Fester is Sarah-Lee Heinrich. The national spokesperson of the Green Youth, Heinrich stands out especially for her fight against racism. For her, this is the fight against the old white man, whom she wants to drive out of Africa entirely. In doing so, she can be quite insulting, as the *NZZ* notes in an article on October 11, 2021. The fact that she herself is segregated in her fight against racism, excluding and devaluing individual population groups, and thus becoming exactly what she claims to be fighting, unfortunately escapes the limited attention of the highly paid cancel culture representative.

The statements of the new federal chairwoman of the Greens, Ricarda Lang, are also grotesque to the point of absurdity. Her present mission is the war in Ukraine. She has already demanded a lot for the victory of the clan regime in Kiev—the rapid introduction of a speed limit, more arms deliveries and even a war tax. In order to compensate for the home-made economic and energy crisis and the associated additional costs for the population, she currently wants to *pay out* an energy allowance. It is unclear whether she has understood that the state derives its money from tax revenues. In other respects, too, consistency seems to be a foreign word for Ms. Lang. Because while the obese party leader calls on citizens to wear masks on public transport, to avoid plastic packaging, to eat healthier, to drive an e-car and

generally to tighten the belt for the collective, she herself sits on the train herself, consumes McDonalds food, drinks champagne from plastic flutes, carries disposable cups through Berlin in the morning and is chauffeured through the capital in an expensive combustion engine.

The fact that the Greens have few problems with double standards is something warmonger Anton Hofreiter likes to prove again and again. While fast food advertising and plastic bags are to be banned, he likes to carry his utensils around in plastic bags—and as a convinced pacifist, he naturally calls for new weapons for Ukraine every day. For members of the supposed eco-party, it is also not a contradiction to be driven to the small electric car with an armored Audi A8 in order to, then, appear with it to the electorate for marketing purposes.

In the meantime, the Greens also provide the new queer commissioner in the Bundestag. As a result, the gender mission, which the party has been pursuing dogmatically and fanatically for years, is likely to continue to gain momentum, and the sexualization of schoolchildren, which has been increasing for years, is likely to increase.

While sexual education used to be the responsibility of parents, with schooling only dealing with the topic on a biological level in the higher grades, the Greens believe that early sexual education should now generally be the responsibility of the state and preferably begin in kindergarten. In Bavaria, for example, school toilets for diverse children are already being discussed. Even if, for example, there are significantly more illiterate people in Germany than people who describe themselves as sexually diverse or non-binary.

In this context, it should not be forgotten that in the 1980s the party advocated the impunity of pedophile relationships. Holders of the Green Party register, for example, were members of a network of pedophiles that was active in Berlin for over twenty years and that has up to 1,000 victims on its record. Much has been reported about the dark past of the Greens. The same applies to the pedophile fantasies of the former party functionary Daniel Cohn-Bendit, who had the relevant archive material blocked by his office and to this day only relativizes his perverse statements, but does not revise them, as the *FAZ* described in April 2013.

The Greens' fixation on young people is no coincidence. Every totalitarian ideology seeks to win over the most malleable parts of society. And these are mainly the adolescents. For the Nazis, it was the Hitler Youth. Today, the indoctrination takes place more inconspicuously via the curriculum. Children are now learning in class what Covid deniers, fake news and Putin sympathizers are.

Democracy education and premature, gendered-diverse sex education complement media propaganda and socially implemented educational measures through permanent states of emergency. But if education restricts horizons, it is not education, it is indoctrination. Thus, green-brown totalitarianism is in many respects not only ridiculous, senseless or counterproductive, but dangerous. In the past, people didn't know whether to laugh or cry at the proposals of the Greens. Today, they tend to teach you to be afraid.

Robert Habeck openly admits that he would like to see a Chinese model of society. Less participation, more social credit system. With centralism, he believes that he can rule through and save the world. Therefore, the Greens are also ardent advocates of the 2030 Agenda with its globalist-technocratic Sustainable Development

Goals (SDGs). In the end, these lead to a social model of total surveillance and limited civil liberties based on the Chinese model.

Fact-checkers such as Correctiv tried to relativize the minister's statements in the aftermath, but anyone who has seen the whole conversation knows that Habeck meant what he said at that moment.

The fact that the well-being of his subordinates only peripherally affects him is also shown by his statement at the World Economic Forum 2022 a few days ago. There, Habeck announced that he wanted to maintain the sanctions against the former Soviet Union even if this led to 100,000 starvation deaths. That's probably what Mao thought, too. The result is known.

Meanwhile, his colleague, book plagiarist and language acrobat Annalena Baerbock, warns of war weariness on Russia's borders. Of course, she too demands arms deliveries on a daily basis. Of course, she is not afraid of the Third World War. She probably thinks like Robert Habeck, who said a while ago: "I don't have to fight and I don't have to die in this war." So the warmongering of the leadership of the Greens continues cheerfully, confirming the old farmer's wisdom that the fish always stinks from the head.

The Greens are a scourge of our time, a New Age sect, and seem to really want to turn Orwell's saying "war is peace" into realpolitik. The *1984* slogan "Ignorance is strength" describes professional demagogues such as Habeck, Baerbock, Lang and Fester in many respects. As smug as this can be commented on, in the long term this political course is extremely dangerous. You should have understood that much even if you don't have a degree in history.

May 29, 2022

Ideology of the Turning Point

Capitalism, socialism, collectivism, corporatism, surveillance capitalism, bioethics, eugenics, transhumanism. These are buzzwords that are currently being used to characterize a global transformation. Although all the terms mentioned are based on the same, inhumane ideology—technocracy.

We are living in disruptive times. The biometric security doctrine of the "new normal" is gradually spreading and proliferating to all corners of civil society, like a malignant brain tumor. Preparations for the next stage of escalation are underway, even if the Covid regime is currently taking a short summer break. The faceless bureaucratic empire of global governance continues to grow with each crisis. It feeds on inaction, ignorance and passivity in large parts of the population. Inflation and supply bottlenecks are getting worse and worse. Corporatist circles, meanwhile, are coordinating their further course of action for the transformation of the world within the framework of isolated conferences in Davos, Geneva and Washington.

And a military conflict continues to simmer in Ukraine, the current status of which no one can precisely determine, as there is no independent, objective reporting from the region. The corrupt, right-wing radical clan around US puppet Zelenskyy has brought the media into line, abolished the opposition and sealed off all frontline areas for foreign journalists.

The sword of Damocles of a Third World War hangs worryingly low over the heads of humanity. No one can say with certainty how far the spiral of escalation on Russia's borders will turn. In any case, the United States is preparing for the worst scenarios and officially rehearsing a nuclear emergency. From May 16, 2022 to May 20, 2022, the NNSA (National Nuclear Security Administration) conducted the alarming disaster simulation called Cobalt Magnet.

More than 30 state services were involved in the exercise, which was the culmination of 18 months of planning, according to the NNSA. So, while the world was still completely under the spell of the Covid crisis at the beginning of 2021, America was already beginning to prepare for a potential nuclear war.

It should be reasonable to assume that health and economic crises, humanitarian disasters and escalating wars would prompt international policymakers to find sensible solutions to protect the population from further injustice. But the opposite is true. Instead of standing up for its voters, the ruling panopticon of nation-states kowtows to supranational structures of international corporatism.

Ostensibly democratic governments make themselves the compliant vicarious agents of totalitarian fantasies of omnipotence of a neo-feudal oligarchy. Thus, the actions of politicians may at first seem clumsy and helpless, perhaps even authentic by some, but in the end the failure of nation-state administration is part of the program. With their miserable crisis management, the supposed representatives of the people are exacerbating precisely those problems that elite interest groups are trying to exploit for their own purposes.

The more trust in the nation state, its ability to act and democratic processes erodes, the greater the citizens' disenchantment with

politics, the easier it is for supranational agitators and oligarchic constructs of domination, for which national borders and national laws have long since ceased to play a role. Thus, the increasing chaos plays into the hands of those who are working to undergo a comprehensive transformation of the planet. And it's just picking up speed.

The question is: Where is the journey going? Looking at the purely political level of current developments, there is every reason to believe that centralism, collectivism and corporatist socialism will shape the revised, multipolar world order under the supervision of supranational bodies. The anonymized, bureaucratic totalitarianism of this near future knows no participation. The individual conforms to the crowd—or is cast out.

Political systems such as socialism, communism or fascism, however, are always only an expression, result or outgrowth of an ideological superstructure. They determine the corresponding model of society. Just as the Inquisition and the Crusades were only the sinister result of the clerically deluded feudal rule of the Middle Ages, the rise of digital totalitarianism is merely an expression of more fundamental beliefs to which the respective decision-makers have fallen.

Therefore, it is important to fathom which ideology motivates the ruling structures of our time to subject the world to a "reset" that leads to dystopia.

The Chinese general, military strategist and philosopher Sun Tzu already knew:

"*He who knows the enemy and himself need not fear the results of a hundred battles.*"

It has become abundantly clear over the past two and a half years that this is an extremely inhumane future in which faceless authorities, algorithms, QR codes, machines and implants dominate humans.

For example, eugenics and transhumanism are often cited as ideological motives of a ruling caste that sees itself existentially threatened by freedom of expression, pluralism, creativity and, above all, overpopulation. And indeed, eugenic approaches are likely to play a not insignificant role in the planning of the globalist "superclass."

Bioethics, a field of research that played a central role in the wake of the Covid crisis, is nothing more than a euphemistic relabeling for long-forgotten ideas of racial theory, depopulation and euthanasia. I have already compiled corresponding information on February 27, 2022, in a detailed article on the topic of bioethics. Even the British *GUARDIAN* reported on the disturbing history of "eugenics and the master race of the left" in an *article* on May 1, 2019.

Transhumanism also takes this line and stands at its core for the abolition of *Homo sapiens*. The ideal of the transhumanist is the cyborg—a genetically and technologically modified hybrid being, a kind of centaur, of man and machine.

In its final form, this creature is connected to the cloud or a matrix and shares a collective consciousness with its peers. This is comparable to the Borg, a warlike people in *Star Trek* who assimilate their enemies instead of killing them. The Borg carry nano-robots in their bodies that function autonomously and, if necessary, rewrite DNA, create new technology in the cyborg's body, or modify the immune system to fight new diseases, for example.

Transhumanism thus insinuates a future that comes very close to the science fiction epic and undoubtedly poses a serious threat to the human species, as I have also already written about this in texts of December 2, 2021 and May 22, 2022. However, even the goals of this school of thought are not sufficient in themselves to explain the deeper motives, which lead to a complete restructuring of the world by a neo-feudal sect of a few thousand super-rich.

Transhumanism and eugenics primarily pursue the goal of changing *Homo sapiens* itself, controlling its evolution and reproductive behavior. Technocracy, on the other hand, is a holistic concept for the consumption-based management of the world, which includes the aforementioned goals but goes far beyond them.

This becomes clear when one looks to the past and sheds light on the basic ideology of the technocratic movement. Unfortunately, these backgrounds are currently receiving little attention, although they offer fundamental explanations for the transformative processes in society, economy, technology and politics since the 1950s and especially for the past two and a half years.

The technocratic movement began with the founding of the Technical Alliance in New York City in 1919. Under the leadership of the shady Howard Scott, the initially fifteen engineers, scientists and technicians initially set themselves the task of documenting the waste of the capitalist system. However, the conservatism and flourishing economy of the 1920s got in the way of the project. There was a lack of political support. Critique of capitalism did not fit in with the spirit of the times. Thus, the group was dissolved just two years after its founding and unfinished business.

But Howard Scott did not give up. He was driven by the idea of finding the ultimate solution, accompanied by his thirst for recognition, being raised in Greenwich Village, New York, with no recognized academic education.

He wanted to reorganize the world. In 1933, together with M. King Hubbert, whom he met in the early 1930s, he founded Technocracy Incorporated. Hubbert had only recently begun working at Columbia University. The elite university seemed to be able to gain something from the radical ideas of the technocratic masterminds.

Scott and Hubbert were allowed to set up shop with their new venture on the campus in New York. From then on, Technocracy Incorporated shared an entire floor with the still small team of IBM. The latter, founded in 1911, was already on the trail of the development of the modern computer while, at the same time, massively supporting the German National Socialists, among other things in transport logistics.

The *Chicago Tribune* reported in 2001 how IBM's Hollerith machines helped IBM's strategic partners in Nazi Germany organize the countless rail transports that transported concentration camp prisoners in cattle cars to the various extermination camps.

Unfortunately, many of the relevant IBM documents from that period have mysteriously disappeared from libraries and archives, so that the details and extent of IBM's sponsorship of Nazi Germany can only be reconstructed incompletely. With Scott and Hubbert, however, the IBM team at Columbia University probably got along splendidly. Because both teams were probably a collection of ingenious to insane nerds who were far ahead of their time in many ways.

In 1933, the technocrats published their concept in the form of a document entitled "Introduction to Technocracy." This is considered the bible of technocratic ideology and to this day marks the foundation on which the movement is based. And after the stock market crash of 1929, the ideas of Scott and Hubbert fell on fertile ground.

The global economic crisis triggered by Black Thursday had permanently destroyed trust in the capitalist system. Politics, business and society were hungry for new ideas and solutions to the socio-economic misery. The technocracy movement experienced a veritable boom.

Chapters were formed throughout the United States to organize regular meetings. The magazine *The Technocrat* was launched. At its peak, the movement had over half a million official members on the East Coast of the United States alone. The ideology quickly expanded to Canada, Germany and many other countries. After 1948, enthusiasm for the subject waned somewhat. Nevertheless, Technocracy Incorporated still runs its own website, publishes a monthly newsletter and organizes conferences.

Based on this history, one might assume that the concept of technocracy is the brainchild of a few avant-garde scientists and utopians who have achieved nothing but a few nice theories. But far from it. For even though the original movement lost momentum, local chapters were dissolved and print magazines were discontinued, the ideology of consumption-driven control of the world had found adherents in the highest circles. High finance and geostrategists in US politics realized very early on that technocratic ideology provided them with a tool with which to implement their totalitarian visions of monopoly, hegemony and population control on a global scale.

As early as the 1930s, the financial oligarchs of US hegemony decided to turn China into a laboratory for the model of a technocratic society—a perfect dictatorship because it was invisible and faceless. Into a bureaucratic-digital monster.

During the Nixon administration, intensive work was done to open China to the West, ostensibly to support the country's economic development. Henry Kissinger, a close confidant of the Rockefeller dynasty, traveled to the People's Republic several times during this period and established trusting contacts with the Chinese leadership. But it wasn't just the Rockefellers who were interested in China. US President Nixon was also personally in Beijing in 1972 and happily shook hands with mass murderer Mao, as original recordings of the meeting show.

Zbigniew Brzezinski, one of the most important geo-strategists of the US government along with Kissinger, even received the Chinese dictator a little later at his home in the United States.

However, it was not Chinese companies that were responsible for the rapid development of infrastructure and China's economic rise. This was only the version sold to the public. In fact, it was the corporations of the military-industrial complex and front companies of the CIA that illegally became active in China, providing capital and technical know-how from the United States. Kissinger and Nixon did not sell Mao Zedong the concept of the free market economy, but presumably that of technocracy.

These circumstances, as well as the power structures in modern China that have grown out of the technocratic seed, were highlighted by *TIME* magazine in an article dated June 27, 2001 that describes how the technocratic approach became increasingly

important in the 1970s and 1980s as well as in the context of Chinese neo-authoritarianism.

How far the pilot project of the technocrats in the People's Republic has progressed is shown by current pictures from China, where the population is kept docile with ever new Covid lockdowns and totalitarian, technological encroachments. The smartphone serves as an ankle bracelet for those in power. Anyone who leaves the permitted range of motion, does not comply with test cycles or writes critical messages must expect government sanctions. Automated.

If you spend too much time on your balcony during lockdowns, you will get a visit from a drone that asks the outdoor cat to stay indoors under threat of sanctions. Robots patrol the streets. Resistance is futile and fades away in anonymous, increasingly digital spaces of an intangible bureaucracy. Emblematic of this dystopian system is the fact that delinquents and criminals in China are to be sentenced by a virtual judge in the future.

This grotesque example of systematic dehumanization goes to the heart of technocratic ideology—because the technocrats have argued from the beginning that governments, states, currencies and even unprofitable people are obsolete in a perfect system. The world must be governed primarily by energy consumption, as this is the only way to guarantee optimal use of available resources. In addition, the technocrats are convinced that technology is not corruptible, less error-prone and free of human disruptive factors such as morality, ethics or empathy that stand in the way of efficient energy management. For this reason, collectivism, corporatism, digitalization, eugenics and transhumanism perfectly complement the concept of technocrats—or are an integral part of it, even if these models of thought are not explicitly named. After

all, they arise logically if the technocratic goal of the efficient use of existing energy is radically thought through to its conclusion.

Viewed from this point of view, the omnipresent UN Sustainable Development Goals, the reduction of the individual carbon footprint or the eagerly postulated climate apocalypse appear in a different light. For while these issues superficially give the impression of being pursued for the common good—to save the world—in the context of technocratic ideology, they are nothing more than totalitarian tools of control.

For the technocrat, nature and *Homo sapiens* are nothing more than resources to be managed efficiently and without emotion.

In 2016, for example, Technocracy Incorporated set up a project group called Transition Plan 2016 to develop concepts for system change. It is steering away from the current capitalism, which is trimmed for constant growth, and towards a sustainable, centralized energy economy. That this is little more than a euphemism should be obvious from the foregoing.

Of course, today's Technocracy Incorporated is little more than an association dedicated to estate administration and member care, but the original goals of the movement are being pursued with more vigor than ever before. On closer inspection, the United Nations' seemingly humanistic and ecological Agenda 2030 is nothing more than a new edition of technocratic principles. This is shown by a look at the technocratic bible from 1933 linked at the beginning.

Only the formulations of the "Sustainable Development Goals" (SDGs) have been subordinated to the zeitgeist and psychological findings for the control of the masses. Who wants to raise

objections to inclusion, sustainability and emission reduction? Yet many of the fluffy UN goals, such as the right to an identity, are more likely to be duties. In this case, the state's obligation to assign a digital identity to every person on the planet by 2030—*and* the obligation of these people to be able to identify themselves with it at any time.

If one thinks through the social goals of technocracy radically to the end, they stand for the abolition of every freely organized society, of the free-market economy and, ultimately, of the spiritual being, the spiritual human being, who, classified as livestock, is euthanized for optimization purposes at the end of his useful life.

The fact that the ideology of technocracy is not a dusty relic of the past is proven in the book *Technocracy in America: Rise of the Info-State* from 2016. The author, Parag Khanna, a prolific strategy consultant and entrepreneur, was a member of the United States National Intelligence Council's Global Trends Program 2030 and seems obsessed with the idea of reshaping the world according to technocratic guidelines.

In the work in question, he advocates a "direct technocracy," a system of technocratic totalitarianism in which people can, at least, still influence their environment indirectly, namely through the data they generate. You can imagine how big this influence will be by looking at China. There, too, people are happy to be surveyed digitally by the state. However, hardly anyone dares to give honest answers.

In December 2016, Parag Khanna's book also found its way into the renowned *TIME* Magazine, which prominently presented the author's radical theses. Not only are the old goals of the technocrats already being implemented with Agenda 2030, but

strategists are also constantly working on refining them. They adapt and modify the concepts of Scott and Hubbert to align with the context of our time. What they all have in common is that they elevate science to a religion, to the absolutism of the twenty-first century.

The fact that humanity is quite receptive to this religion has been impressively demonstrated by the Covid cult. It has focused the magnifying glass on the identity crisis of our species and revealed more than ever that many people are overwhelmed with the modern world and especially with themselves, and that they've lost values, goals and self-confidence a long time ago. They stagger around between addictions, work, smartphones, Netflix and superficial social contacts. Nervous distraction crowds out reflection. This makes us receptive to new promises of salvation, to warmth and leadership.

So it fits well into the picture that WEF favorite Yuval Noah Harari, who recently made a name for himself with his irritating prophecies on the subject of transhumanism, defined the religion of the future as early as 2015: dataism.

In his book *Homo Deus—A Brief History of Tomorrow*, he describes how all political and social structures can be considered as systems of data processing, and consequently dataism explains that "the universe is made up of data flows, and the value of a phenomenon or entity is determined by its contribution to data processing." That's why the dataist's primary goal is to maximize the flow of data and link more and more media with each other. It's not just surveillance capitalism, digitalization or a Fourth Industrial Revolution—it's technocracy. But with his theses, Harari tries to provide the cold mechanical with a sacred underpinning, a spiritual basis.

He goes on to write:

"*We can interpret the entire human species as a single data processing system, for which each individual human serves as a chip.*"

Harari predicts that in the near future, humans will give algorithms the power to make the most important decisions of their lives, from career paths to partner choices to medical treatment. And in fact, *Homo sapiens* is already subconsciously controlled by its own innovations more often than it realizes.

The current developments regarding data protection and the creeping abolition of privacy underline that Pandora's box has long been wide open in this area.

Despite various scandals of the recent past, massive data leaks and obvious misuse of personal information by corporations and states, the resistance of society to the invasive plans of governments and supranational institutions with regard to the protection of their own data is limited. After all, many people are willing to sacrifice their freedom for supposed security.

Case in point: Facebook. The company had embezzled the personal data of about 87 million users and made it available to the company Cambridge Analytica. The latter used the information, among other things illegally, to provide analytical support for the election campaigns of Donald Trump and Ted Cruz in 2016. The company was also accused of collecting, analyzing and using data to manipulate the public during the Brexit referendum in the United Kingdom. Cambridge Analytica filed for bankruptcy in 2018. A pawn sacrifice. After all, other companies did exactly the same thing before and after—but made sure they didn't stay in the spotlight.

At the time, this scandal caused an outcry among the population and brought topics such as personalized advertising (targeting), nudging and psychological manipulation of the masses into focus. Nowadays, people seem to have largely come to terms with the fact that corporations and governments secretly harvest data and use it for their questionable purposes.

The Facebook-Cambridge Analytica scandal would have been an opportunity to take a closer look at the corporate purpose, business practices and financial background of Mark Zuckerberg's company in general. After all, what is generally perceived as a start-up of a quirky IT nerd may just be the continuation of a project of DARPA, a research institution of the United States military. By 2003 at the latest, the company had set up "Life Log," an IT project that had set itself the task of collecting all activities, information, interactions and interests of US citizens, whether online or offline, in a central database.

For each person, there should be a kind of personalized timeline that the authorities can use to trace the person's entire life. After the public got wind of the matter, the Life Log project was officially discontinued on February 3, 2004.

Facebook went online exactly one day later, on February 4, 2004, with seed capital from investor Peter Thiel, who has close ties to the military-industrial complex and US intelligence agencies, and has been collecting the very information that DARPA once targeted. The only difference is that users are now willing to make them available to the company and its backers themselves.

Plague or Cholera?

"Politics: To persuade voters that political faith is political thinking." (Rudolf Rolfs)

Elections, or electoral principles, are the holy grail of the democratic system. They convey a sense of participation to the many and thus legitimize a representative rule of the few. Any doubt as to their proper execution is considered heresy in the West. They are seen as blasphemers who dare to question official election results or criticize irregularities in voting, counting and projections.

Historical events as well as current examples suggest that even the supposedly inviolable core process of the democratic system is by no means as trustworthy as the state would like its citizens to believe.

To be able to take elections seriously at all, to actually live participatory, democratic processes in society, it would first of all require a well-founded and free political formation of the individual. However, for the past two decades, if not more, the conditions allowing for such a formation have not been guaranteed for the average citizen of the West. Propaganda, nudging and social engineering have always made the flags of the masses fly in a state-approved wind direction, not only since Covid.

"Democratic politics is still decided according to the winner-loser principle. The traditional majority principle

continues the struggle for victory or defeat. It creates conflicts, divides society and leaves behind hostile camps.

A large part of the energy used is consumed against each other, of course also at the expense of the common good." (my translation; Siegfried Schrotta, *LebendigeDemokratie;*)

Furthermore, a democracy—provided one even strives for this form of government despite the fact that it is nothing more than a simple cost-benefit analysis of the ruling caste—would have to be mercilessly grassroots democratic and decentralized. The federal state would be governed by a militia parliament, like the Swiss model. The concept of the Swiss-style Landsgemeinde with a public, roll-call vote would also be conceivable.

However, there is no doubt that there is a need for strictly regulated terms of office and referendums on virtually all political issues. And there should not be professional politicians, no lobbyists, public-private partnerships, NGOs and supranational organizations that manipulate and instrumentalize the sovereign at will to pursue overriding interests. If all these conditions were met, then elections would indeed be worth something.

This does not appear to be the case. The Federal Republic of Germany is as far away from a true democracy as any other European country. This is already clear from the fact that the general course of the government hardly undergoes a significant change, even if the party spectrum changes at the top. Election promises remain hot air, no matter who makes them.

Even more striking is the situation in the United States, the figurehead of the supposedly liberally organized Western values, where just two parties are supposed to embody the pluralism of

the huge country and its structurally, socially and economically completely different states.

Top-level politics in the United States is an obscene spectacle of rich oligarchs. Only those who have built up an influential network in the establishment and can raise tens of millions of dollars in donations for their campaigns have a serious chance of winning a senatorial post or the presidency. It makes no difference whether Bush, Biden, Clinton, Obama or Trump mimics the greeting clown.

And in the other fake democracies of our time, too, elections are nothing more than show. They are entertainment for citizens who are not completely disgruntled with politics, or a sedative for the dull masses who are looking for orientation or guidance in uncertain, chaotic times. The old adage, attributed to Mark Twain and Kurt Tucholsky, among others, that elections would be forbidden if they could change anything, has rarely described the situation more aptly than it does today.

A smug comment by Horst Seehofer, which he once made in the German TV show "Pelzig untergespräch sich," also describes the influence of elections in modern democracy very vividly:

> **"Those who decide are not elected. And those who are elected have nothing to decide."**

What was very telling, too, was the oppressive silence of the audience, whose laughter almost got stuck in their throats in the moments after this sentence, which was delivered quite seriously by Seehofer. Unfortunately, however, the revelation of the CSU veteran does not seem to have disturbed the belief in the political Punch and Judy show in the long term. Even though voter turnout among the population has been steadily decreasing

for a long time, the majority of people still legitimize their own oppression through the ritual of voting.

Even the choice between plague and cholera can still be sold as a choice. The entire representative system of modern governments is based on lies and deceit. And on the almost religious belief of large parts of the population that they can influence this system by means of elections. Even if only indirectly and minimally.

A small spark of hope for change is enough to continue to bind people to the promises of salvation of modern democracies and to rally around the flag. This wafer-thin glimmer of hope for redemption, the next choice of direction, the great leap or leader, is the silken thread on which the stability of Western democracies hangs.

Thus, the modern state is constantly striving to combat any doubts about the legitimacy of its processes. This is in line with current reports that the ANTIFA-affiliated interior minister of Germany, Nancy Faeser, is planning to prosecute the "delegitimization of the state" more harshly.

Translated from newspeak, this means that criticism of politicians, polemics, a text like this one or, in the worst case, even satire, are pushed to the verge of being a criminal offence. Anyone who still thinks such conditions are democratic certainly also believes that the arms industry is working for world peace.

In the United States, too, it is currently becoming clear once again what the principle of participation and the vote cast by the voter are still worth. On June 8, 2022, the *Washington Examiner* first reported that a former representative of the state of Pennsylvania had pleaded guilty to election fraud. The 79-year-old Michael

Myers admitted to falsifying ballots, bribery, obstruction of investigative agencies and conspiracy to manipulate votes on a large scale in favor of the Democrats in the 2014 and 2018 elections.

On the same day, *US News* published an article about a member of the Republican Party in New York who had been charged with election fraud in a similar case, but who was ultimately able to save himself from more serious legal consequences with a deal.

In addition to these personal problems and the corruptibility of people in power, the Dominion voting machines are repeatedly at the center of criticism in the United States.

For example, on June 16, 2022, the conservative ex-US Army cadre Dr. Rich Swier published a clear text entitled "Voting machines continue to destroy confidence in our elections."

And the following day, *FreePressers* reported on new legal problems in New Mexico. Even though the company has repeatedly insisted that its voting machines are safe, complaints about Dominion are piling up from election to election.

In addition, it is still unclear why the Dominion machines are connected to the internet at all during the election and why the software apparently offers possibilities for retrograde adaptation of data. Unfortunately, it is only a matter of time before these systems become widespread in the rest of the world.

In the meantime, the Heritage Foundation has set up a database that compiles information on current cases of voter fraud in the United States. And the numbers speak for themselves. For example, there are currently 1,357 confirmed cases of electoral fraud and 1,167 official penalty orders in this regard. Not exactly

a small thing for the self-proclaimed world police of Western values. And the number of unreported cases is likely to be—as always—significantly higher.

But even in the best Germany of all time, there is little of the gold that glitters. For example, the scandal surrounding election fraud in Berlin in the context of the last Bundestag election is drawing ever wider circles. The *Tagesspiegel* had already pointed out discrepancies in the final result in the capital on September 22, 2021. And Anonymous News, among many other outlets, wrote about the various discrepancies in voting in Berlin as early as September 30, 2021.

The scandal even made its rounds in Austria. However, since any misconduct has always been rigorously rejected by official bodies so far, a repetition of the Bundestag election now even seems possible.

In an article published on May 24, 2022, *RND* quotes the returning officer Georg Thiel as stating that the conduct of the Bundestag election in Berlin represents a "complete systematic failure of the electoral organization." This is not a very confidence-inspiring conclusion. Similar signs of erosion of democratic processes were evident not so long ago in Great Britain. There was fierce criticism and controversy over the 2019 elections.

Even if the election commission came to the conclusion in the official result that large-scale electoral fraud had not taken place, a bitter aftertaste remains. Because already in 2017 there was turmoil in the early elections to the House of Commons. As the BBC reported on March 2, 2018, the Electoral Commission received over 1,000 emails at the time—and 60 letters from 47 members of parliament. In France, too, things are not going well for the democratic idea. Former

President Nicolas Sarkozy's chief of staff, Claude Gueant, was sentenced to one year in prison in early 2022 for embezzling over seven million euros for manipulating polls, as reported by France24.

Sarkozy himself had been indicted several times the year before and had also been sentenced to prison. On the one hand, because of fraud in the context of his election campaign in 2012, on the other hand, three times because of corruption. Even in the Grande Nation, the arrogance of the neo-feudalists seems to know no bounds.

This list could go on forever. After all, election fraud is the order of the day. It always has been. Just like the manipulation of opinions, media, polls and projections in order to manipulate the mood of the population. Corruption, nowadays preferably marketed under the label of *cooperation*, determines the system. This is absolutely logical. After all, there has been no democracy for a long time, but technocratic corporatism.

And this system knows no political spectrum, no left or right. It only knows the top and the bottom. For this reason, it can hardly be changed with the help of its own processes, methods or institutions. Fortunately, it will eventually fail because of its own arrogance, like all empires.

In the meantime, it is important to develop new ideas, build alternative structures and become as independent as possible from a paternalistic state, a monopolizing platform economy and oligarchic financial cartels. This sounds like a Herculean task, but it starts with practically everyone. Because if you are not willing to leave your comfort zone, stand up for your values, raise your voice, delete corresponding apps, cancel cards and boycott companies, you will ultimately get the government you deserve.

In these times, non-conformist currents need to work together, at least temporarily and across ideological differences, to generate sufficient social momentum for fundamental change. Because you can't win a flowerpot with elections.

What a pragmatic course towards a genuine grassroots democracy could look like is vividly described in a text by Friedemann Willemer that is well worth reading, which was published by apolut.net on June 17, 2022 under the title "The Constitutional Revolution."

In order to achieve the result described by Willemer, however, a real mass movement is needed. This does not mean that 80 percent of the population must participate. But it must be something more than a worn-down, scattered and divided resistance. Many solution-oriented discussions still revolve around models of thought and forms of society that the ruling system has long since overcome and only keeps alive for the amusement of the masses.

As interesting as conversations about the advantages and disadvantages of democracy, socialism, communism or liberal approaches may be, they lead nowhere. After all, a promising model of society that enables autonomy, prosperity and social peace for all presumably consists of elements of grassroots democracy, private law society and socialism. Anyone who doggedly defends one of the common concepts and its ideology is part of the problem.

After all, the tunnel-vision-like debate about a supposed silver bullet is rarely constructive. On the contrary. It creates additional fragmentation in the sections of the opposition that are willing to resist constructively. And that only plays into the hands of the ruling caste. In times of economic turbulence, in the light of wokeness, cancel culture, gender madness, newspeak and permacrisis, the latter can rely on the fact that "divide et impera"

works better than the Romans, who have already made successful use of the strategy, could ever have imagined.

So, what will happen first is what happens again and again at regular intervals in the history of human civilization—it has to get much worse before it can get better.

It is to be hoped that after the collapse of the next empire, not simply a new guard of power-hungry ideologues and do-gooders will take over, but a united human family that wants to live in harmony with its environment in a self-determined way.

"All tyrants rule by deceit and violence. But when the fraud is exposed, they have to rely entirely on violence."
(George Orwell)

Tragedy and Hope

"The powers of finance capital had a far-reaching goal, none other than the establishment of a system of worldwide financial control in private hands, capable of dominating the political system of each country and the world economy." (Carroll Quigley)

Incompetence, inability, lack of expertise, solidarity, social pressure, ideology, factional pressure, stupidity, ignorance, greed, obsession with power—or simply coincidence. With these and various other classifications, quite a few people, even those who are critical of the official course or narrative of the day, try to explain the abstruse events of the past two and a half years as well as the actions of key people in the public eye.

However, even skeptical and well-informed contemporaries often vehemently refuse to acknowledge that, for example, the internationally concerted approach in the wake of the Covid crisis was no coincidence. That there might have been a plan. That crises are deliberately brought about or amplified by interest groups to use the disruptive momentum for otherwise difficult to justify change processes. And even more devastating—that elections, forecasts, polls and projections are rigged. Is the entire system pure façade? This cannot and must not be the case. Although even a 2014 study by the elite Princeton University came to the sobering conclusion for any Democrat that there is no correlation

between what the United States voter wants and the actual course of action of the government.

The fact that the state is not primarily concerned about the population and that criminal agreements, associations and conspiracies are the rule rather than the exception is something that the American government in particular has blatantly demonstrated time and again.

Whether Watergate, Iran-Contra or the assassination of John F. Kennedy, whether it's the sterilization of 70,000 indigenous people, state-organized terrorism in South America, illegal experiments on humans in the course of the MKUltra program, the abuse of homeless people for medical tests, or even the clandestine nuclear contamination of three small US towns during Operation Green Run—the multitude of criminal attacks by the US government against its own people is almost unbelievable.

If you want to convince yourself of the unscrupulousness that the state has done and is doing to its citizens in the land of unlimited opportunities, you will find a lot of material in the virtual reading room of the CIA.

Thanks to the Freedom of Information Act, a large number of formerly classified documents are now accessible to everyone. They show that Washington and Langley in particular were not above anything. Why should it be any different today, when the digital-financial and military-industrial complex now have much more efficient methods and tools at their disposal than ever before?

Thus, politics in late modernity takes the same position that the church held in the Middle Ages. The speeches and appeals of the

supposed representatives of the people are the sermons—and the elections, which have to be repeated in regular rotation, are the creeds of the adepts, disciples and frightened and subservient congregations. What the contemporary counterpart to the church's selling of indulgences might be is left to the imagination of the reader. There is no shortage of choices.

In the dystopian present, many may simply lack the time, leisure and energy to deal in detail with all the wild and disturbing events of our time, their political, financial and economic backgrounds as well as their historical, social or cultural context.

This is understandable—and no coincidence. Others lie to themselves because truth can be very hurtful, and self-knowledge can be extremely painful. In a tragic way, they probably hope that they will never have to perceive themselves again.

Some just don't want to see it and prefer to take the path of least resistance anyway. They stay out of everything. And another group probably consists of middlemen, hangers-on and accomplices.

The facts are obvious and are usually freely accessible. Optimism, in this respect, is simply a lack of information. Or ignorance, malice and self-denial.

Whether it's COVID-19, the Ukraine war, food shortages, monkeypox, an economic and energy crisis or the postulated climate catastrophe—for all these transformation processes, crisis scenarios or catalyzing events, there are documents from official bodies and responsible actors that suggest that the current state of affairs was deliberately brought about—or that circumstances that lead to were at least accepted with approval. Even if they are exclusively to the detriment of their own population.

The best-known example of this is probably two publications of the World Economic Forum (WEF) in Davos these days—The Great Reset and The Great Narrative. Although the first book clearly states that the supposed pandemic is seen by the economic elites as an opportunity for a neo-feudal restructuring of the global economy and social coexistence—and appeared suspiciously early after the start of the Covid crisis—it is still often denied that the "Great Upheaval" is organized crime. Similar to the mafia. Because it's called a conspiracy. And this term has negative connotations.

In addition, in the minds of many people, there is still the illusion of smoky salons and mystical places where a handful of elderly gentlemen secretly meet to forge conspiratorial plans to achieve world domination. They don't want to see cronyism and corruption taking place in public today—disguised as cooperation. But that's exactly what has become the case.

The criminal conspirators of our time sit in parliaments, talk shows, boards and editorial offices. The neo-feudalists of the Fourth Industrial Revolution are intent on building social consensus rather than clashing with adversaries. After all, resistance makes change more expensive.

It is true that this was quite different in the past. That's why the strategy has been adapted.

Before embarking on elitist endeavors such providing the Bilderberg Conferences, the Trilateral Commission, Chatham House aka the Royal Institute of Foreign Affairs, the Council on Foreign Relations and its German counterpart, the Atlantik-Brücke, the US-China Business Council or the Bohemian Club with a marketable façade, in order to take some wind out of the sails of opponents through manipulative public relations, these secretive circles of

the ruling caste preferred to operate in secret—and in case of headwinds, with violence.

This changed with the spread and consolidation of mass media and, above all, the internet. What could no longer be kept secret was successively softened and made public. In the case of particularly conspicuously inhumane undertakings, the name was changed first. For example, *Foreign Affairs*, the official magazine of the Council on Foreign Relations, was called *the Journal of Race Development* until 1922.

The *Journal for Biosocial Science* at Cambridge University was called *The Eugenics Review* until 1969. And so on.

In addition, publicly accepted organizations for the implementation of strategic goals of high finance had long since been founded. The more pronounced corporatism became, the less the oligarchs themselves had to appear. You now rule indirectly, through the United Nations, the WHO, the WTO, the IMF, OPEC, the European Union or the Bank for International Settlements.

That the creation of many of these organizations can be traced back to the operation of a manageable number of super-rich oligarchs, financiers and families is neither a secret nor fiction. Because the arrogance of this self-proclaimed ruling caste goes so far that it itself writes extensively about its megalomaniacal fantasies of omnipotence.

We think only of David Rockefeller, who was the first representative of the Rockefeller clan to publish a biography, although the family's roots can be traced back to the early seventeenth century and to Neuwied near Koblenz. The title of the almost 700-page book, published in 2003, is *Memoirs of a World Banker*. In his

memoirs, the financial mogul, who died in 2017, explains how he stood on the subject of globalization—in Rockefeller's case, this is actually a euphemism for world domination—and how proud he is of the massive influence he has exerted on geopolitical conditions through organizations he finances, directs or founded, such as the CFR or the Trilateral Commission.

> **"We are at the beginning of a global upheaval. All that's missing is a major global crisis before the nations accept the new world order." (David Rockefeller, Bilderberg Conference 2005)**

More information about the globalist activities of the Rockefellers and their astonishing influence on the financial and geopolitics of the last century can be found in the official family archive, Rockefeller Archive Center.

Of particular interest here are the collections on the organizations funded by the family, such as the Population Council, the Social Science Council or the aforementioned Trilateral Commission. The latter states on its own website that it was founded by "private individuals," but avoids mentioning the name of the initiator as much as possible. The influence that a cross-generational planning clan like the Rockefellers can have on world politics by means of foundations, think tanks and NGO vehicles should be easy to see and hard to dismiss after reviewing the family's own documentation.

The Rockefellers also exemplify how the public appearance of the super-rich neo-feudalists has changed over time. The family was widely hated for their nefarious business practices. It is not for nothing that patriarch John D. Rockefeller and his son made an effort to change their image with the advent of television. Away

from the ruthless, unscrupulous, reclusive big capitalist at the beginning of the twentieth century, to the generous, friendly and publicly visible philanthropist of the dawning media age. The Smithsonian Channel aptly describes it in a video report on the striking image change of the Rockefeller clan with the words:

"*Thanks to the spread of the medium of film, audiences can now see the lives and lifestyles of the rich and famous. The kings of thieves become celebrities*."

Now the Rockefellers are just one powerful industrial clan among many, which undoubtedly influences the course of the world to this day. The Carnegies, among others, have had similar successes. As early as 1886, Andrew Carnegie published a book in which he called for the globalization of America, as only this course could lead to worldwide dominance of the establishment he represented. Disguised as democracy.

Much more influential were the Rothschilds, whose name is widely known for its fine wines. Even the Wikipedia page on the subject, which is rather scarce in view of the family's actual influence, gives an idea of the possibilities of political influence open to this family in the course of its more than 200-year history.

If you want to know more about it, you will find remarkable information in the official and very extensive family archive of the Rothschild family. Since 1789, the unimaginably rich clan has been influencing the course of the world to an unprecedented extent—and to this day, mostly in secret. On the well-known rankings of the super-rich, the name Rothschild never appears. The family no longer needs this due to its historical influence and its perfidiously organized corporate, foundation and investment structures.

It only appears in public with ostensibly charitable activities and a few small private banks. This has long made the House of Rothschild a target of critics. And rightly so. Because in this case, too, it is—simply put—a matter of organized crime. It doesn't matter at all that the family has Jewish roots. Even if this is, of course, the common defense strategy of the clan and its supporters—to label every critic of the Rothschilds as an anti-Semite.

Therefore, it must be briefly noted at this point that I would denounce and condemn the family's practices in the same way if they had a Buddhist, Muslim or Christian background. Because this is not about religious affiliation but about fraud, theft, white-collar crime, corruption, anti-democratic activities, obstruction of justice and warmongering to the detriment of the entire human civilization.

The documented background of the technocracy movement, which has existed for almost a century, the dark history of eugenics, alongside the development of China or Russia in the twentieth century, also give every reason to believe that recent world history is not only based on clumsy coincidences and that things took their course organically. This contradicts all logic after examining the information given so far.

Anyone who, after reviewing the above-mentioned documents, evidence and circumstantial evidence, still wants to take the view that there are no overarching, long-term and international strategies or plans that have led to the current status quo of the planet and the "rules-based world order" proclaimed by the oligarchy (strategies that are completely independent of political spectrums, processes and events), will find additional evidence for this working hypothesis in the testament of Cecil Rhodes, which is freely available as a book in PDF format.

Rhodes was one of the most influential people of his time and in his last will and testament unequivocally described how he intended to posthumously emphasize his visions of a new order in the world—namely by founding secret societies that would infiltrate politics, economics and finance and, according to Rhodes and company, influence them in the long term.

After his death, Lord Alfred Milner, who ruled the British colonies before Winston Churchill, continued his plans and founded, for example, Milner's Kindergarten, which later gave rise to the fabled Round Table movement—which is believed to continue today in organizations such as Chatham House, the CFR, the BIS, the IMF or the Trilateral Commission. After all, the trail of money is rarely deceptive in criminalistics.

"Why should we not form a secret society with only one object, the advancement of the British Empire and the subjugation of the whole world under British rule, for the restoration of the United States, in order to make the Anglo-Saxon race a single empire? What a dream! But it is probable, it is possible." (Cecil Rhodes)

Another quote from the former financial mogul and namesake of Rhodesia (today the Republic of Zimbabwe) illustrates whose brainchild Cecil Rhodes was:

"*The native is to be treated as a child and denied the right to vote. We must adopt in our relations with the barbarism of South Africa a system of despotism, such as operates in India.*"

Some may argue that these are the power-obsessed, solitary and fascistic visions of individuals, old ideas that have nothing to do with the present.

That this is not the case is shown by renowned academics and generally recognized authors such as Professor Antony C. Sutton (1925–2022) or Professor Carroll Quigley (1910–1977). Sutton authored books such as *Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler*, *Roosevelt and International High Finance*, *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution* and *Trilaterals on Washington*. The latter book was co-written with Patrick M. Wood, who still runs the recommendable website technocracy.news .

In his works, Sutton uses well-founded research to show which covert forces were and are at work behind known historical events. And when reading his writings, it quickly becomes clear that these are always the same influential circles that influence the course of the world to their advantage.

Whether Russia, China or Hitler's Nazi regime—everywhere Anglo-American high finance had its fingers in the game and made history as we know it today possible in the first place.

Anyone who takes the trouble to analyze the corresponding historical evidence of the past 100 or 200 years can hardly come to any other conclusion.

> **"The argument that the two parties should have opposing ideals and strategies, one perhaps on the right and the other on the left, is a stupid idea that is acceptable only to doctrinaire and academic thinkers. Instead, the two parties should be almost identical, so that the American people can kick out the villains in every election without any deep or sweeping changes of course." (Carroll Quigley)**

Sutton's remarks are corroborated by the work of Carroll Quigley, who taught as a professor at Georgetown and at the

elite universities Harvard and Princeton, and who gained access to the secret archives and documents of the Council on Foreign Relations and the Royal Institute of Foreign Affairs due to his contacts with the United States establishment. His most famous student is probably Bill Clinton, who publicly thanked his former professor during a speech in 1992.

Quigley spent almost twenty years working on what is probably his best-known book, *Tragedy and Hope*, a tome that was published in 1966 and, depending on the edition, ran up to 1,300 pages.

Tragedy and Hope: A History of the World in Our Time is significant because Quigley was closer to the powerful circles about which he writes than any author before him. That's why he got access to the sensitive information in the first place. Another may be that he was initially quite sympathetic to the agenda of Anglo-American high finance. His more than influential friends probably did not expect that Quigley would drag their secret plans and anti-democratic activities into the public eye.

But that's exactly what he did. Even though the "explosive" parts of the book only make up about five to ten percent of the more than 1,000 pages, these sections are more than revealing. And in the course of his two-decade-spanning work on *Tragedy and Hope*, Quigley must also have noticed that the activities of this power-happy clique of super-rich globalists are not worthy of support, but to be condemned. The following excerpts from his book underline this assumption:

"*For the first time in its history, Western civilization is in danger of being destroyed internally by a corrupt, criminal ruling cabal that revolves around the interests of Rockefeller, which includes elements of Morgan, Brown, Rothschild, Du Pont, Harriman and*

Kuhn—Loeb and other groups as well. This junta took control of America's political, financial and cultural life for the first two decades of the twentieth century. (...)

This system was to be controlled in a feudal manner by the central banks of the world, which acted in concert, through secret agreements reached in frequent meetings and conferences. The apex of the system should be the Bank for International Settlements in Basel, Switzerland, a private bank owned and controlled by the world's central banks, which are themselves private enterprises. Each central bank (...) sought to dominate its government through its ability to control government bonds, manipulate foreign exchange, influence the level of economic activity in the country, and influence cooperative politicians through consequent economic rewards in the business world." (Carroll Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope*)

The personal and professional consequences Quigley had to bear after the release of *Tragedy and Hope* are reminiscent of today's cancel culture. Despite his undisputed reputation as an excellent academic, historian and author, he was attacked, shunned and defamed by the groups he had exposed with his work. Funding for his research work has been cut.

In public, he was reproached above all for not having cited any sources in *Tragedy and Hope*. However, considering that his research was primarily based on confidential documents that were not made available to anyone before or after him and that were considered secret or non-existent, the omission of footnotes makes sense, of course.

However, Quigley learned his lessons from these events. He withheld his next book, *The Anglo-American Establishment: From Rhodes to Cliveden*, even though it had been completed

since the late 1960s, and decreed that it could not be published until after his death. This happened in 1981, four years after the death of Carroll Quigley. What he lacked in *Tragedy and Hope* for understandable reasons (references, footnotes and quotations), he delivered posthumously with this work—and thus dispelled any doubt about the seriousness of his previously cited theses.

"*Professor Carroll Quigley presents crucial keys without which the political, economic and military events of the twentieth century can never be fully understood.*" (Google Books)

"*The reader will see that this is true of past, present and future events. The Rhodes Scholarships, established due to the terms of Cecil Rhodes' seventh will, are known to everyone. What is less well known is that Rhodes bequeathed his fortune through five previous wills to form a secret society dedicated to the preservation and expansion of the British Empire. And what no one seems to know is that this secret society (...) still exists today (...). This group is, as I shall show, one of the most important historical facts of the twentieth century*." (Carroll Quigley)

Now, the more than 1,000 pages of *Tragedy and Hope* are not easy fare and very few readers can be expected to do so in their entirety, as Quigley himself admitted at the time. Unfortunately.

Because if more people were aware of these historical facts, the present would appear to them in a completely different light.

For this reason, it is gratifying that the American author Joe Plummer has taken the trouble to compress Quigley's life's work to a generally acceptable level. In 2014, Plummer published his 224-page book, *Tragedy & Hope—The Illusion of Justice, Freedom and Democracy,* which summarizes the most important passages

from the original work and condenses them into a volume acceptable to the masses.

Plummer's summary also includes valuable tips on further reading and brief explanations of Quigley's remarks to help the historically unfamiliar reader better understand the context of the original work.

Plummer's summary also includes valuable tips on further reading and brief explanations of Quigley's remarks to help the historically unfamiliar reader better understand the context of the original work.

On his website, Plummer makes the entire book available free of charge, along with additional notes, information and texts, which comprise another almost 600 pages. An insightful 2016 interview by historian Richard Grove with Joe Plummer can be found on YouTube.

It should be indisputable that at least the attitude of the state towards its population as well as the history of the past 100 years appears in a different light than the history books teach in view of the historically verifiable information from reliable sources cited above. After all, history is always made by the winners. Even the most die-hard skeptic should at least have slight doubts about the official account of one or the other economic, geopolitical, social or technological development, and about the goodwill of the state towards the people living on its territory. This is especially true because the world of 2022 bears striking similarities to the future that technocratic neo-feudalists such as Rhodes, Ford, Carnegie, the House of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha (since 1917 House of Windsor), the Rockefellers or Rothschilds envisioned over a century ago as the ideal for their ruling caste.

"In the twentieth century, a power structure emerged between London and New York on this original financial basis (...) which penetrated deeply into university life, the press and the practice of foreign policy." (Carroll Quigley)

Of course, despite this overwhelming abundance of incriminating evidence, everyone is still free to assume that all the synchronicities of recent history are pure coincidence.

However, such an attitude has little to do with logical thinking, deduction and reflection. Faith is probably the more accurate description in this case.

June 24, 2022

Late Roman Decadence 2.0

Of unequal distribution, concentration of power and organized crime of technocratic neo-feudalism.

“There’s room at the top, they are telling you still—but first you must learn how to smile as you kill.” (John Lennon, Working Class Hero)

The brazen arrogance of the ruling class can hardly be surpassed. Many contemporary witnesses would be prone to resort to this adage—only to learn a mere hours, days or weeks later that the arrogance can indeed be surpassed. One monstrosity follows the next. Today it’s the Diamond DA62 aircraft. It’s new price at market launch in 2015 was an impressive 920,000 euros, almost one million.

The owner is Friedrich Merz, federal chairman of the CDU since January 31, 2022. And that’s not the only aircraft that the former German head of Blackrock, the world’s most influential asset manager, owns. Merz also owns a Socata TBM 900 machine with a list price of 3.7 million US dollars.

Through his company Volatus GmbH & Co. KG, he leases these to WEPA Industrieholding SE. So, very down-to-earth, a man of the people. This could already be observed in the context of

the so-called millionaire debate, where Merz's condescending statements revealed more of him than he intended to.

So, it is hardly surprising that the CDU leader jets to Sylt with his Diamond DA62 to attend the cliché wedding of FDP chief turncoat Christian Lindner. The punks, for their part, who managed to make it to the island by means of the German rail system's 9-euro ticket, have probably been removed from the high society idyll of Sylt's cityscape in the meantime. Thus, the island's posh glamour was restored, Lindner-style, which is not much different from the tact demonstrated by Merz.

Lindner chauffeured his bride, a well-connected RTL reporter, in the freshly polished Porsche to the final party in the celebrity bar Zanzibar, where such illustrious guests as the financial lobbyist and CumEx specialist Olaf Scholz or the deputy editor-in-chief of *BILD* Paul Ronzheimer are ready to celebrate the social happening with the newlyweds.

"Late Roman decadence" seems to me to be the appropriate description for the three-day hustle and bustle of the political caste on Sylt. A phrase that former German foreign minister Guido Westerwelle used in 2010 to criticize Hartz-4 and the accompanying "promise of effortless prosperity." Even then, it was a topsy-turvy world. His argument was that, instead of categorically fobbing people off with undignified handouts and driving them into systemic dependency, the state should create framework conditions that enable every individual to finance themselves and their own livelihood.

In this context, *Focus* asked on July 10, 2022—"The Lindner wedding: A disconnect from reality or typical German envy?" The answer: neither. The ruling class is well aware that it is living in a bubble. Well-cushioned and hermetically shielded

from the inconvenience of constant crises and the bitter reality of life of the average citizen. Given their awareness, a disconnect from reality cannot account for their publicly celebrated ostentation and pageantry.

Envy, on the other hand, could well play a role in the negative reception of such expensive celebrations in economically turbulent times.

Who can blame a population that is promised by top politicians in an unbearably arrogant manner that the poor and old might soon have to sleep in public heating halls if the (home-made) supply bottlenecks for gas falls short of heating their homes properly? And perhaps it is not envy but simply contempt that the ruling caste is met with by people who are advised by the state to take cold showers, not to eat meat or to do without the car.

All this while the country's supposed elite flies around the world, squandering taxpayers' money, ignoring the Ahr Valley flood victims and celebrating lavish parties.

Not that such audacity is new or surprising. The only surprising thing is that this organized crime, disguised as a political system, has functioned for so long. Whether it's the Berlin airport, mask deals, intensive care bed rip-offs, Karl Lauterbach's evidenceless fear-mongering, billing fraud in Covid citizen tests, the panic paper of the Federal Ministry of the Interior, Merkel's chancellor dinner with constitutional judges, the Baerbock book or the million-dollar villa by Jens Spahn—there is incompetence, cronyism, corruption and organized crime, no matter where you look.

But arrogance has its price and usually comes shortly before the fall. The fact that a tyrant can deceive a part of his starving people

from time to time, but not all people all of the time, was already articulated musically by Bob Marley in April 1973 when he released the song "Get up, stand up," written together with Peter Tosh.

"The best things in life are not the ones you get for money."
(Albert Einstein)

The German caste of politicians, corrupted by corporatism, has demonstrated with its behavior since the proclamation of the Covid pandemic like never before that it does not represent the interests of the voters but those of its sponsors, stakeholders and supranational strategists. Those who think and live in this way are hardly interested in others succeeding in order to contest their position afterwards.

Following this logic, it is obvious why the entire socio-economic system—a corporatism that has been carefully honed over the course of decades by high finance—is designed to make the rich richer and the poor poorer. It's about theft. This is precisely the singular goal of a central banking system that seeks to seize the entire planet's resources by means of technocratically organized corporatism. The initiators, beneficiaries and supporters of this system have almost reached that goal.

According to one study, the so-called Gini coefficient, which is a statistical measure used to determine unequal distributions in a group, was 0.892 at the global level in 2000. According to the report, the richest one percent of the world's population owns a whopping 40 percent of the world's wealth. The wealthiest 10 percent collectively owned 85 percent of the world's wealth. The poorer 50 percent together own only one percent. A Gini coefficient of 0.892 is close to a situation where out of 100 people, one person owns 90 percent, while the other 99 people are left

with 10 percent. In this context, the inflationary nationalization of land for nature conservation purposes also appears in a more diffuse light.

While it is undisputed that, for example, threatened rainforests or coral reefs and their inhabitants must be effectively protected from destruction, it must also be possible to ask what the state intends to do with all the other land areas that it already directly or indirectly controls.

In the United States, depending on the state, up to 50 percent of the land is under state administration—and thus beyond the reach of the general public and the free market.

A detailed breakdown by state in *Headwater Economics* illustrates the ownership structure in America. The situation is similar in Germany, as described in an article in the *FAZ* on October 19, 2020. Less than half of Germany's forests are still privately owned, with the rest belonging to the state or federal government. And anyone who can afford forest as a private citizen is certainly not one of the 99 people in the aforementioned Gini model, who are left to share the remaining ten percent like dry breadcrumbs falling from the rich table.

Oxfam recently reported that the Covid pandemic has massively exacerbated social inequalities. While around 160 million more people worldwide slipped into poverty from March 2020 to November 2021, the wealth of the ten richest billionaires doubled during this period. For example, the assets of the super-rich increased more during the pandemic than in the entire previous 14 years. For the financial elites, COVID-19 was a gold rush. A disaster for the rest.

As the saying goes, money doesn't make you happy. That's certainly true. But it's reassuring. Because if you have enough of it, you don't live in constant fear of inflation, unpaid bills, rising energy prices, overdue installment payments or the possibly horrendous costs of an unplanned car repair. Moreover, money stands for freedom in the ruling system. Unfortunately. Because it allows investment, expansion and, with increasing wealth, emancipation from the system. Those who are wealthy enjoy additional freedoms, privileges and amenities.

And those who are really rich live in a cushioned parallel world that has no points of contact with the reality of life of over 90 percent of the world's population.

"*Anyone who earns more than 3,529 euros net per month is in the top ten percent in Germany. Childless couples, who have more than 5,249 euros net per month at their disposal are also among the richest ten percent*"—writes the *Berliner Zeitung* in an article from July 7, 2020. The editors refer to a study by the IW (Cologne Institute for Economic Research).

On July 10, 2022, the *Handelsblatt* reported, also with reference to data from the IW, whose last update dates back to 2017, that singles in Germany with a net income of 3,892 euros or more are among the richest seven percent of the population. This figure is calculated according to the rule of thumb that someone is considered rich if they have twice the median income available each month.

And that is currently 1,946 euros per month. The comparison calculator at the end of the *Handelsblatt* article visualizes the income gap. The IW also explains that the population often mistakenly assumes that wealth only begins with a monthly income of 7,000 euros or

10,000 euros net. In addition, the economic analysts note that many Germans generally greatly overestimate the proportion of rich people in the population. This is a fatal mistake in determining the individual's financial position in the prevailing system.

This is not because one should now act like a bon vivant, feel like a rich big capitalist, or consider oneself as belonging to the top seven percent when bringing home a net wage of about 3,900 euros a month, but because income distribution and the official definition of "rich" are excellent indicators for describing the true nature of a neo-feudal turbo-capitalism in which the average worker is kept like livestock—namely against all the promises of the traitors to the people, legitimized by those workers through elections.

A 2014 graph of Germany's wage and income tax statistics shows that the air at the upper end of the income scale is quickly thinning.

At that time, little more than 100,000 people earned about 10,000 euros gross per month. With a total population of just under 82 million people, that's not exactly a lot. Especially for a country whose political system supposedly wants to offer every citizen the best educational paths, qualified apprenticeships, entrepreneurial freedom, fair markets, modern infrastructure, permeable hierarchies, fair opportunities for advancement and the chance to own a home. An illusion.

For the vast majority of Germans, the dream of wealth currently ends at an officially staked out 3,892 euros. Parallel to this capping of the capitalist vision—from rags to riches—the richest German families are of course getting richer and richer.

Then there is the lower end of the social hierarchy. The dregs, as investment bankers in London and New York like to call it.

The election and gossip cattle. The other side of the income gap. Those who receive welfare. The standard rate for single persons is currently EUR 446 per month. In Germany, however, anyone who has less than 1,000 euros net per month at their disposal is considered poor. The official, arithmetical delta between rich and poor in Germany is therefore either 3,446 euros or 2,892 euros.

This is the meagre carrot in front of your nose, which you run after as a pack mule in the hamster wheel of a long working life. The projected monetary horizon for lifetime performance as an average worker. It is the scope for maneuver and socio-economic tension defined in an economic policy that determines the success or failure of a human existence in this society. Be it prestige and luxury—or ostracism and lack.

At banks, however, you are not considered wealthy even with 3,892 euros net per month.

Many financial institutions only promote customers into the "rich" category if they have one million in the respective local currency available in their own account at short notice. And if you want to be one of the rich and beautiful in Switzerland, you should already have around 30 million francs in the bank. Below this amount, you are not a welcome guest at the exclusive private banks. Starting with 100 million Swiss francs, you can finally count yourself among the super-rich.

After all, one in ten of the world's billionaires lives in the tranquil Alpine republic. A total of 210,700 people living in the country have assets of more than one million, as *swissinfo* documented in 2010. Eleven years later, on October 4, 2021, *Nau.ch* reports that you are one of the richest one percent with assets of 4.7 million francs or more. That's 86,000 people out of a population of about 8.2 million.

There is only one country in the world where the threshold for belonging to the richest hundredth of the population is higher than in Switzerland. Because in Monaco, you are only counted among the exclusive one percent elite from 7.3 million francs. From 15.4 million francs, you are one of the richest per thousand in the Alpine republic. There are different standards. For tax purposes, the amount of declared income of three percent of the Swiss population equals that of the remaining 97 percent. For this three percent, a very simple definition of wealth can be applied: rich is one who does not have to work.

In state schools, children have long since ceased to be prepared to lead a self-determined life that could lead to such financial success on their own. A life that considers their personal abilities and preferences. An existence that encourages them to take responsibility for themselves, their ideas and actions.

Permanent employment with a large corporation, economic security and social acceptance are preached as ideals. In other words, conformism and dependence.

In this way, children do not become creative, motivated, characterful and courageous entrepreneurs, but intimidated, dependent and horizonless followers.

Where education restricts the horizon of thought,
it is no longer education but indoctrination.

Young people continue to be lured with utopian promises of prosperity and security, which predatory capitalism, which has been permeated by corruption, cliques and bubbles, has long since been unable to live up to. And certainly not the German democracy of 2022. The system imploding at fast speed can only

delay its extinction by implementing an increasingly authoritarian corporatist model of rule. What this looks like in detail has been very clear since the financial crisis of 2008 at the latest—and with the Covid crisis, the democratic façade of the democracy business model, which is based on oppression and robbery, finally fell.

But it is not only the representative party system that is an irritating deception. Even the dreams it sells to its offspring are nothing but brightly shimmering, wafer-thin and quickly bursting soap bubbles. After all, no one gets rich with normal work these days. And even the state does not help anyone out of trouble who has reached the bottom. On the contrary. The salary of a full-time job is often barely sufficient to adequately support a family with two children. Germany's welfare and social assistance programs are too little to live on—and too much to die of. Owning your own home, private education, cultural experiences, fascinating hobbies and enriching journeys—for many people this is simply impossible. Equal opportunity? Not at all. Instead of private assets, over-indebtedness in particular is on the rise.

People live on credit, as current figures from the Deutsche Bundesbank underline.

The middle class is dwindling. Slowly but surely. And thanks to a suicidal sanctions policy of the West against Russia as well as a pseudo-scientific, blind, ideology-driven environmental policy of the dark green Woko Haram apocalyptic sect, soon even the big earners in the best Germany of all time, in other words, those with 3,892 euros net per month, will soon come to the bitter realization that the last tree has been nationalized, the last river has been closed off, and the last fish has been protected—but that you still can't eat money.

Even more striking is the unequal distribution of wealth and resources in the United States. The richest 10 percent of Americans, for example, owned about 84 percent of all tradable stocks in 2016, *Money* reported in 2017. By contrast, one-third of the US workforce is so destitute that they no longer have access to pension funds and retirement savings. In 1983, 62 percent of Americans could afford to build up retirement savings. In 2016, it was only 17 percent.

A diagram from the Federal Reserve Bank shows how the distribution of wealth in the United States has changed since 1990. It is hardly surprising that the richest 1 percent became consistently wealthier no matter who presided, and the bottom 50 percent slipped further into poverty.

As early as 2014, a study by the elite Princeton University came to the fatal conclusion that US policy is geared exclusively to the needs of the rich. The mass of US citizens has practically no influence on the political course. "Nearly zero," or "statistically irrelevant"—these are the terms used at Princeton to describe the effects of democratic participation. Which, conversely, means nothing other than that elections in America have no effect whatsoever. It's a costly *Truman Show*, paid for by the interchangeable and mostly clueless extras themselves. Nothing else.

In 2020, the *Financial Times*, in cooperation with Morgan Stanley, concluded that billionaires were able to increase their wealth worldwide by five trillion dollars over the course of the year and now own 13 trillion dollars. The number of billionaires increased from 2,000 to 2,700 over the course of 2020.

Crises always act as a turbo on redistribution from the bottom to the top. That's what history teaches. That is why the "temporarily

permanent" state of emergency is the declared goal of the ruling caste. As a result of these developments, the head of the German Institute for Economic Research (DIW), Marcel Fratzscher, described the first year of the Covid pandemic as the most financially successful year in human history for high finance.

A 2011 study by ETH Zurich entitled "The Network of Global Corporate Control" impressively shows exactly how this tiny group of the well-heeled divides the world among themselves. The network topography of the international financial and corporate oligarchy developed by the authors impressively shows how few people control how much on this planet. For the first time, the study not only sheds light on the direct influence of financial forces on markets and politics but also takes a closer look at indirect influence across a wide range of levels of participation.

Data from more than 43,000 companies were evaluated. As a result, 147 organizational units control almost 40 percent of all monetary values of transnational corporations. The top 25 most influential players around the globe are depicted in a short article on the ETH study conducted by Blick Log on August 22, 2011. A more than frightening concentration of power that cleverly eludes public perception through feigned market diversity.

In January 2012, filmmaker David Wilcock also took the trouble to expose the oligarchy's financial networks and, above all, its criminal, cartel-like activities. In a very detailed text, Wilcock describes how the ruling financial system came into being, who, in addition to the Rockefellers and Rothschilds, has benefited significantly from this Ponzi scheme for generations through the exploitation of the population, and how the resulting monetary power is exercised to this day via the technocratic corporatism implemented with COVID-19.

By the way. If you think Elon Musk, Bill Gates, Jeff Bezos or Mark Zuckerberg are rich, you should look at some figures on the family fortunes of the traditional financial elites, those people whose family trees date back to the sixteenth century and who are not in the public eye. Depending on the definition, this top group consists of ten to thirty families that have been increasing their wealth for generations and operate primarily in the banking sector.

> **"Anyone who thinks that you can have anything for money is easy to suspect that you are willing to do anything for money." (Benjamin Franklin)**

For example, the Rothschild family currently owns about 1,800 properties in Europe and England. Value: 36 billion. In addition, the family officially owns 55 yachts, 10 private jets and 13 luxury hotels.

There are $70 billion in cash reserves in the bank's own banks, and the Rothschild equity fund, with which the family has a stake in every major company in the world, has a budget of another $100 billion. In total, the Rothschild clan had a net worth of $480 billion in 2021.

Analysts expect this publicly communicated figure to surpass the trillion mark in the foreseeable future—a goal that the authoritarian rulers of Saudi Arabia, with their estimated fortune of $1.2 trillion, have already achieved. But the Rothschilds probably do too. But it can hardly be checked in detail. Because the available, meager information on the family assets of the banking clan is only those figures that they are obliged to be published or that can be reliably determined—and there are not really many of them.

The Rothschild family likes to keep a low profile when it comes to shareholdings, profits, balance sheets or ownership—and makes an honest effort not to have to appear in public too often.

Nevertheless, the Rothschilds do not appear on Wikipedia's list of the richest families in the world. There is also no mention of the Rockefellers, Morgans or Du Ponts. Neither do the British monarchs. In view of the massive influence that such financial private conglomerates have and can have on politics, the economy and society, this is a strange circumstance. After all, those who operate undercover are rarely up to any good.

This is probably also the reason why the previously mentioned clans are hardly noticeable to the public. Their assets are distributed, structured, split and parked in such a way that at first glance they cannot be associated with the names mentioned. Fortunately, the history books and newspaper and family archives are filled to the brim with evidence of the deliberate, systematic unequal distribution of resources and wealth. If you follow the financial flows closely, you will recognize the fraud.

The *History Channel*'s website has a more realistic ranking, which identifies the aforementioned families as the most powerful in the world in identical order.

The list is only supplemented by the Bush family in fifth place. The introduction to the article reads:

"*There are families that are more influential and powerful than the American president and other political masterminds. Over the centuries, they have built empires and thus steer the fate of the world in the background. Here are the five families that control the world.*"

The fact that 0.1 percent of the world's people together own 81 percent of the world's wealth was confirmed even by the Swiss tabloid *20 Minuten* on June 14, 2022. And anyone who

assumes that things would be different in the crypto market, which is praised as an alternative to the commercial banking system, is mistaken. There, too, there is an unequal distribution, as *Forschung und Wissen* explains on January 9, 2022.

For example, only 0.01 percent of the owners together hold 27 percent of the circulating supply of Bitcoin. It's a similar story with other cryptocurrencies. That should give us pause for thought. Not to mention the fact that electricity-dependent cryptos are more of a psychological preparation of the masses for central bank digital money than a crisis-proof, libertarian or anonymous means of payment.

Statista also confirms the immense gap between rich and poor. Referring to Credit Suisse's Global Wealth Report, the portal reported on October 22, 2019 that only 10 percent of humanity owns 83 percent of the world's wealth. All these facts allow only one conclusion: the grotesque unequal distribution, the extreme concentration of wealth and the monopolization of resources are of a structural nature.

They are the results of a fiscal Ponzi scheme designed to distribute value from the bottom up. And it does so across generations, wars and political currents.

The prevailing financial and economic system was created by representatives of high finance to serve high finance.

In his 2013 book *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*, French economist Thomas Piketty argues that extreme wealth inequality collides with the values and principles of social justice that are fundamental to modern democratic societies. He goes on:

"*The risk of a drift toward oligarchy is real and gives little cause for optimism about the course of the United States.*"

This formulation suggests that the oligarchy feared by Thomas Piketty did not yet exist when the book was published almost ten years ago. That's wrong.

For the representative-democratic system itself is nothing more than a construct of the ruling caste. It creates the illusion of popular participation and helps the elites to reduce resistance. This is exactly why the ancient Greeks implemented it.

The only thing that is "new" is the ever closer and more obvious fusion of politics and economics, which has taken on more and more extreme forms over the past century and is now culminating in a rules-based global governance of public-private partnerships—in totalitarian, technocratic corporatism. Benito Mussolini would be happy, as the Italian dictator described corporatism as the perfect form of fascism many years ago.

"If people understood the monetary system, we would have a revolution before tomorrow morning." (Henry Ford)

It is to be hoped that the rapidly increasing economic and financial upheavals will soon contribute to more people dealing with the structural problems of the neo-feudal system—and that the self-confessed anti-Semite Henry Ford was right with his prophecy.

Because the cross-generational networks of the ruling class and its corrupt henchmen in politics and business need us—not the other way around.

July 17, 2022

Liberal Braggers

During the post-factual Covid crisis, the FDP was considered by many to be the last bastion, the last bulwark of liberal democratic basic values. This wishful thinking is likely to have ended abruptly with the new edition of the Infection Protection Act recently presented by the responsible ministries.

"*The Free Democrats are the party of freedom and self-determination. Together with our members, we have updated our mission statement and reaffirmed our shared values and goals.*"

Listen, hear! Clear statement. Or rather baseless self-adulation? In any case, the sentence can be found on the website of the Free Democratic Party of Germany (FDP) under the menu item "Our values." It comes from a party that has around 73,000 members (as of September 2021), currently ranks at seven percent in the polls and is nevertheless still allowed to provide the Federal Minister of Justice. His name: Marco Buschmann, a lawyer and party soldier. Aside from the passionate Porsche driver, party chairman and professional opportunist Christian Lindner, Buschmann is the main beacon of hope for the party's electorate in the 2021 federal elections.

In the run-up to that recent election, the FDP was conspicuously focused on wooing people who, disappointed by their own political organizations, would be looking to opt for an alternative that whispers about "freedom" after the lockdown trauma of society.

Already during the exploration and negotiation phase for the current government coalition of SPD, Greens and FDP, Lindner and Buschmann sang the mantra of proportionality, personal responsibility and a completely new course in pandemic management. And Wolfgang Kubicki—as the "good cop" and social media gambler of the apparatus of Covid measures—did the rest to push the FDP's image of a liberal and constitutional doer.

"*There is an absolute end to all measures—and all measures will end at the latest with the beginning of spring on March 20, 2022.*" (Marco Buschmann, press conference on October 27, 2021)

It turned out differently. Contrary to all the promises of the supposedly liberal saviors. What remains of the FDP's bourgeois stance after almost a year of coalition authoritarianism, wokeness and cancel culture is illustrated by the press release of the German Federal Ministry of Health of August 3 on the "Further development of the Infection Protection Act (IfSG)."

The measures jointly announced by Buschmann and his colleague in the Federal Ministry of Health do not really read like a manifesto of self-determined life. The paper is not a tribute to freedom and autonomy. No evidence of value-oriented programming. On the contrary. If the revised version of the IfSG were to be adopted, this is to be regarded as an authorization without proof of evidence. Period.

Germany's Federal Minister of Health, the pharmaceutical lobbyist and panic preacher Karl Lauterbach (SPD), has finally reached his goal. The totalitarian state of measures that he has long longed for, operating in a permanent state of emergency, could soon be a reality. Buschmann acts as a compliant stirrup holder. At least on the surface.

Secretly, both probably know which masters they serve in their positions.

Thus, the libertarian flair of the FDP minister has very little influence on the decision-making. It would be tiring to discuss in detail the empty words of the bill or the specific, ostensibly antiviral measures that are to take effect from October 2022. The core message is: The COVID merry-go-round continues to spin merrily. Mandatory masks in schools and on long-distance transport, testing regimes and—of course—ongoing mRNA treatments. But with a new timing. More brazen and encroaching than predicted by many critical voices. Every three months.

The quarterly vaccination subscription, for the prospect of which until recently one was vehemently called a conspiracy theorist. In the best case. Thus, under "Don CumEx Scholz" (SPD) and his FDP junior partner, Germany continues pretty much exactly where former agitator Angela Merkel (CDU) handed over the ruins of the country, which has been battered by her lockdown marathon.

It's the well-known concept of Germany's Covid measures, called "2G" and "3G". Even if these designations are no longer mentioned in the official press release of the ministries. De facto, however, the envisaged regulations mean that only those who keep their mRNA injections up to date or are freshly tested can fully participate in social life. The gratuity for compliant use of the state-imposed injections is the exemption from the mask requirement.

Those who are not willing to follow the sovereign treatment cycles will probably have to cover their face again in the restaurant from October until they arrive at their seat. Or on the way to the toilet. And everywhere else, too. In this way, the system and its henchmen

will be able to detect state delegitimizers and dissidents in public spaces somewhat more comfortably in the future.

This regulation testifies both to a bursting of a legal dam and to hair-raising historical oblivion. Just like the proposal of Germany's Ministry of Health to mark unvaccinated guests in establishments with stickers. Thus, the political magazine *Cicero* on August 5, 2022 can only come to one conclusion if it assesses the restrictions on fundamental rights of the dark (winter) season, dubbed with trivializing euphemisms such as "winter tires" and "snow chains": "Disastrous."

The potential capacity restrictions for events and hospitality businesses as well as a continued obligation to wear masks indoors—in addition to rapidly rising inflation and corresponding cost pressure on the public—could well mark the final death blow for a large number of small and medium-sized businesses.

In addition, with the new legislative arrogance of the Federal Government, an arbitrary ban on assemblies can again be proclaimed at any time. Due to the tense pandemic situation. At this point, at the latest, would be the red line for any true democrat.

However, this passage of the text of the law is certainly not inconvenient for the power-drunk conspiracy in Berlin. Language acrobat and Foreign Minister Annalena Baerbock expects popular uprisings and social unrest in the fall because of the imminent shortage of gas and the galloping cost of living. In addition, increasing protests from opponents of Covid democracy, the democracy movement, peace activists and workers' associations are to be expected.

In addition to Fridays for Future, Extinction Rebellion, gender madness or lootings. So, the streets were full. And chaos.

A few weeks ago, Interior Minister Nancy Faeser had already preemptively announced that demonstrators critical of the system are basically to be assigned to the right-wing, in other words the criminal spectrum. Let's see how long this clumsy framing lasts when twenty, thirty or fifty percent of the population refuse the faceless empire and goes to the barricades.

The chancellery seems to fear such scenarios—and is already proactively expanding its own horizons of action. They are doing so by engaging the civil military, something that has always been, rightly so, controversial. From October 1, 2022, the police in Germany will be officially supported by the Bundeswehr. Subsequently, both organizations are to be subordinated to a territorial command headquarters of the Bundeswehr, which is directly subordinate to the Federal Ministry of Defense.

The Bundeswehr already announced this on June 13, 2022 in a brief announcement on its homepage. Journalistenwatch asks in this regard in an article from August 1, 2022:

"*Are they already training for the civil war here*?"

In any case, Marco Buschmann has gone quite a long way—in the direction of Chinese conditions—for a party that has taken up the cause of freedom and shamelessly parades the term "democracy." The vaccination requirement for institutions and facilities was also introduced, although Christian Lindner, quite clearly concerned primarily with his advantage, always categorically rejected this in the run-up to the 2021 federal elections. And even the supposedly critical admonitions and demands of Bundestag Vice President Wolfgang Kubicki will, likewise, vanish into thin air without any consequences.

After all, he also evaluated his mRNA injections as personal "Freedom Days." His other demands, such as shorter quarantine periods, an easing off on the obligation to wear masks and milder lockdowns, also do not bear the signature of the radical freedom fighter and liberal pioneer. His latest ranting on social media channels in relation to the draft by Lauterbach and Buschmann therefore seems as implausible as it is staged: "*The German Bundestag can't just decide that*," Kubicki is quoted (my translation) by *WELT* on August 5, 2022.

Nevertheless, that's probably exactly what will happen in the end. Out of a lack of alternatives. It is the technocratic bio-security doctrine of Germany, a course that is obstinately steering into chaos. And that is in favor of the corresponding profiteers on the side of the pharmaceutical cartels and the financial-digital complex. That's how corporatism works.

There should no longer be any doubt about this after the experiences of the past two Covid years. Hardly anyone takes serious offence at the sometimes-criminal entanglements of politics, business and the media. See the dedicated line of the Federal Minister of Finance to the Porsche Group headquarters. So, it comes as no surprise that FDP leader Lindner recently gave the "I do" to a well-connected RTL journalist working in Germany's capital, followed by a lavish three-day party on the island of Sylt, popping champagne bottles, documented by the tabloid press. An expensive VIP party.

And this in times of rampant economic and social hardship. This arrogant audacity goes counter to Lindner's otherwise slick clean-cut image. As is the fact that the doer and well-versed self-promoter has been known to "powder his nose" since his youth, as a former classmate of the FDP leader reports.

The aloof arrogance of this neo-feudal caste of modern professional politicians knows no bounds. This is also reflected in the planning of restrictions for fall and winter 2022.

Because at the latest with the current revision of the German Infection Protection Act (IfSG), injustice becomes law—but also resistance becomes a civic duty. Albeit this was also true of the first iteration of the Act. Then, however, the adoption of the Act could have possibly been justified with a crisis bonus, stress, lack of planning and helplessness or overambitious action. This is no longer possible or acceptable. The facts are on the table. All.

Those who do not orient themselves to them and instead to ideology, capital and an overarching, fascistic globalist agenda are acting illegally, undemocratic and totalitarian. Ultimately, even those who believed that the FDP was the last straw should realize this. The last bastion of a democratic canon of values? Hardly.

Former FDP chairman Guido Westerwelle would be surprised at all the things his comrades approve of and support these days. After all, civil rights were indeed a central issue for him. At least that's what he wrote into his party's record book. In his farewell speech as party leader on May 13, 2011 in Rostock, he said presciently:

"*Ladies and gentlemen, of course we in Germany do not live in times when violence poses a threat to freedom. Instead, it comes across differently. The threat to freedom in Germany does not come loudly with violence, but it comes quietly.*

It comes with all kinds of justifications. With often well-intentioned justifications. For example, when it comes to civil rights. Times

when we are all worried about the threat of terrorism. Where, of course, we must all do everything we can for our citizens so that they can lead a happy life unharmed.

In times like these, parties and politicians come along and say that this is the time when civil rights, which always bother us a little bit anyway, can be reduced piece by piece.

Freedom always dies inch by inch, Karl-Hermann Flach once said. And freedom does not die at the hands of politicians. It does not die because civil rights and civil liberties are to be restricted for the sake of politics. Rather, it becomes dangerous for freedom when citizens forget their own immune system, which must arm them against any threat to freedom."

A little more than a decade later, the Free Democrats are waving through the bill for an enabling law that opens the door to state arbitrariness.

One would be in good spirits these days if freedom were to die only inch by inch. Instead, they are now marching towards dystopia with seven-mile boots, heading in lockstep towards a paternalistic collectivism. Westerwelle, who died of leukemia, is likely to be spinning in his grave in view of Buschmann's approval of the draft of the new Infection Protection Act.

Because, considering the fact that masks do more harm than good and that children are hardly at risk from Covid-19, the so-called vaccinations do not protect against infections and do not seem to show any real benefit beyond that—au contraire! Any term other than "totalitarianism" would be out of place to characterize the tyrannies of the German state of measures against its own population, which are becoming normal.

In the fall of 2022, for example, those who refuse it, for good reason, will probably be forced to wear face diapers. Among the reasons is that microplastics settles in the lungs of people who wear masks over a longer period of time. Ironically, those who would readily wear the face mask, given their ongoing paranoia about a virus, are exempt from having to wear them. And, of course, a scenario where people would be allowed to wear a mask of their own free will is unthinkable in the authoritarian faction. God forbid, they would risk being considered unvaccinated. If you want to antagonize all sections of the population across the board, the coalition government is on a very good course.

However, Covid is by no means the only issue on which the FDP's actions are diametrically opposed to the values of its mission statement. In the "Karlsruhe Freedom Theses of the FDP for an Open Civil Society" of April 22, 2012, the party still considered the freedom of the individual to be the foundation and limit of liberal politics. This paper, comprising a total of 118 pages, is littered with liberal buzzwords such as freedom, self-development, sovereign citizens, the rule of law, self-determination, civil society, democracy, openness, growth, prosperity, diversity and progress.

Unfortunately, no one in the FDP seems to remember the thesis paper. Ten years later, Lindner, Buschmann, Kubicki and co. are implementing exactly the opposite of what the party once seemed to be about. And this does not only apply to the Covid crisis.

"*The press is the artillery of freedom*," FDP grandee Hans-Dietrich Genscher once said.

The kind of artillery that the FDP is dealing with these days is part of arms deliveries to Ukraine. The loudest propaganda trumpet in this sector: Agnes-Marie Strack-Zimmermann. For the sake

of simplicity, hereinafter referred to as “Artillery Agnes.” She is Chairwoman of the Defense Committee of the German Bundestag.

In addition, the latent NATO warmonger is active in the presidium of the Förderkreis Deutsches Heer and as a member of the German Military Technical Society. She is also Vice President of the German Atlantic Society and a member of the Advisory Board of the Federal Academy for Security Policy. Conflicts of interest everywhere you look.

Of course, Strack-Zimmermann is also on the road on behalf of freedom. However, only for people in Ukraine. Exclusive to the Donbas. The German population, for its part, seems to be only of peripheral interest to her. Thus, Artillery Agnes is demanding new arms deliveries for peace in Europe practically every day. In other words: deaths for fake democracy. But they are “only” Russian deaths, and Ukrainian cannon fodder. A repulsive tragedy of humanitarian decay.

The FDP politician has obviously not yet come up with the idea that the guiding principles and values perverted by the FDP via “new normal newspeak” could apply to all people on the planet, regardless of nationality, religion or skin color. Every war is to be condemned, since military conflicts primarily cause suffering and destruction for an uninvolved civilian population.

Every weapon delivered to a crisis area is one too many. It’s as simple as that. There is only black and white.

And anyone who turns his theories of freedom into a plea for a peaceful, prosperous Europe cannot in good conscience support the corrupt Azov regime in Kiev in provoking a nuclear power on behalf of US hegemony. A diplomat like Hans-Dietrich

Genscher—whose unfinished speech from the balcony of the Prague embassy in September 1989 regarding the departure of East German citizens still resonates—would be turning in his grave now.

Unfortunately, there is little resistance in the ranks of the Free Democrats to support Ukraine's NATO proxy war on Russia's borders. The enemy in the east is standing. Warmongering and open racism against people of Russian origin continue unabated. The decades-long demonization of the only superpower on the European continent by the particular interests of Western forces is bearing fruit. And Washington rejoices. After the Second World War, one of the greatest concerns of the military-industrial complex in America was that Russia and Germany could henceforth be linked in partnership.

This collaboration would have posed a serious threat to the supremacy of US hegemony in continental Europe.

The situation is quite different when it comes to the Infection Protection Act. There is resistance from the party base. All throughout the country, long-standing members are breaking away from the FDP, feeling betrayed and sold. On Twitter and other platforms, they vent their anger at Marco Buschmann. Quite a few have already decided, announced or completed their resignation from the party.

In view of the fierce criticism of the bill by Buschmann and Lauterbach, *WELT* journalist Tim Röhn is already cautiously predicting that it will not be ratified in this way.

However, since Mr. Röhn has not been able to report anything about Event 201, GAVI, WHO funding, the Wellcome Trust or

the role of DARPA in relation to mRNA patents, despite being *WELT's* chief reporter on the topic of Covid, there is every reason to believe that his results and forecasts should be taken with a pinch of salt.

This applies equally to the baseless election promises of the party oligarchy or its euphemistic models. They are not worth the paper they are printed on. As is so often the case, one could have seen the disaster coming. One could have been able to interpret the signs of the times on the horizon, examine economic relationships and study geopolitics.

Alternatively, simply on the basis of personal experience of witnessing several election periods and donation scandals—we think only of the Möllemann case—we should realize that it makes no serious difference who resides in the Chancellery, because modern corporatism instrumentalizes its corrupt governments and corrupt media as vicarious agents. It instrumentalizes it for an agenda that has long since left behind morality, national borders and feelings of shame and put humanism on the back burner.

The fact remains: top-level politics is a soap opera suggesting participation in a governmental system—a technocratic corporatism—in which left and right no longer mean anything. This model does not have ideological spectrums. Because it's all about up and down. And about control. The bottom 90 percent of the wealth pyramid should urgently become aware of this before they have finally lost the last meager remnant of it.

"We want to gather people around us who do not want to become something, but who want to be something; namely, themselves, men of their own courage and responsibility." (Theodor Heuss, first chairman of the FDP)

There could hardly be a better way to summarize the demands on the members of an extra-parliamentary, grassroots democratic or liberal opposition in late 2022. It is sad if not shameful that the current FDP leadership is in no way able to appreciate this premise of its first party chairman. But that's probably how it is when freedom no longer dies inch by inch.

August 7, 2022

Working Class Hero

A pinch of Beatles mystery. And a tribute to what is probably the strongest political lyric of all time—set to music and published by John Winston Lennon over half a century ago.

"When I was five years old, my mother always told me that happiness was the key to life. When I went to school, they asked me what I wanted to be when I grew up. I wrote down "happy." They told me that I didn't understand the assignment, and I told them they didn't understand life." (John Winston Lennon)

John Winston Lennon was ahead of his time. And his band. At least in terms of his political and philosophical views and views. The Liverpool-born musician was the founder and official bandleader of the most successful rock group in music history—The Beatles. Even if in the late phase of the band's congenial formation his childhood friend Paul McCartney tended to be in the foreground, musically as well as in the media.

The Beatles' first single, "Love Me Do," was released in 1962. After the band had set numerous all-time records that are still valid today—and continues to set them, as with, in 2018, with the longest time span between two identical number 1 placements—the four artists parted ways again in 1970. But eight years were enough to change the world.

The four "lads" are said to have sold around one billion records to date. The band's love of experimentation and innovation ensured that their work resonates to the present day. And even after 60 years, the songs still sound surprisingly "fresh."

In terms of technology, too, the exceptional musicians—supported by the sound engineers of London's Abbey Road Studios (formerly EMI Studios)—broke new ground with each release. In addition, they redefined the relationship between artists and record labels and producers, delivered the first true concept album in pop history and invented the DI box (Direct Injection, D.) in the studio, with which electric guitars could now be connected directly to mixing consoles. A revolution.

They were the first band to print song lyrics on their albums, organized the first stadium concerts, recorded the first hard rock song in history ("Helter Skelter"), were hosted on the world's first live satellite television show, alongside grandees such as Pablo Picasso or Maria Callas, and laid the foundation for the "music video" format as we know it today with their music films. The Rolling Stones' first chart hit was also penned by Lennon and McCartney.

In 2004, the music magazine *Rolling Stone* rightly awarded the Beatles first place among the 100 greatest musicians of all time. After their last album together, *Abbey Road*, which is listed in the discography before *Let It Be* but was recorded afterwards—because *Let It Be* is the only Beatles album that was not produced by George Martin in London, but by Phil Spector in the United States, and therefore came out later—the band split up due to various differences. Artistically, organizationally, privately—they had grown apart. Their energies were depleted. Fame and money took an additional toll.

So much for the official story. For the astronomical success of the four bards from Liverpool also seemed to attract and release dark forces.

To this day, tons of fans and nerds like Mike Williams deal with the numerous mysteries that have always given the band an aura of mystery.

From the supposed exchange of Paul McCartney for a doppelganger, because the real Beatle is said to have died in a car accident in 1967, to the picture of Aleister Crowley, the controversial occultist, and other oddities on the cover of *Sgt. Pepper's Lonely Hearts Club Band*, there are a number of myths surrounding the history of the Fab Four.

For example, the rumors circulating since the 1960s that the Tavistock Institute, a British social engineering institution, had misused the band to promote the flower power movement in order to lay the foundation for the fragmented and ego-centered society of the media age. Possible. For, as we have to admit today, the revolutionary efforts of the flower children of the Swinging Sixties mostly fizzled out in the living rooms of a well-to-do middle class. With the end of their adolescence, they have delegated the responsibility for saving the planet to NGOs, left-wing parties and a few exposed activists. However, one still waits in vain for world peace.

Doubts about the official account of the untimely death of Brian Epstein, the homosexual manager of the Beatles, also persist. He is said to have died on August 27, 1967 from a drug cocktail. Other voices claim that he was eliminated or committed suicide because he was unhappily in love with John Lennon and rejected by him. Or because there was an effort at higher levels to cover up the sexual escapades of the two.

There are also questions about the improbable musical complexity of some of the Beatles' compositions. In the opinion of quite a few experts, the Fab Four, who were not well versed in music theory, could hardly have accomplished this on their own. Sir George Martin, the producer of the Beatles, on the other hand, had a classical musical education.

It is well known that he was responsible for the string arrangements for pieces such as "Yesterday" or "Eleanor Rigby" and that he always gave the young musicians tips and suggestions. It is unclear whether there were other people who had a significant influence on the compositions.

A large number of dubious deaths in the band's environment are also unsolved to this day. First and foremost, that of Mal Evans, the Beatles' long-time road manager and Jack of all trades. Next to Neil Aspinall, Evans was probably the person who was closest to the band over the years. A friend. He was shot with six bullets by American police in Los Angeles in 1976. Allegedly, because he opened his motel door and held a gun in his hand. As it turned out, however, it was just a toy gun lying on the table in the room. In addition, Mal Evans was considered a level-headed, reliable and loving person—Paul McCartney called him a "good-natured teddy bear." However, not a single Beatle attended Mal's funeral.

Interestingly, Evans had a manuscript with him. And a suitcase full of documents with intimate information about his time with the Beatles. The next day, he wanted to discuss both with his publisher Grosset & Dunlap, who would also help him with the publication of an insider book. Both the manuscript and the suitcase containing the documents have been missing since the lethal visit of the LAPD (Los Angeles Police Department). The former Beatles roadie

was cremated on site in LA and then sent back to England by urn, where it was initially lost in the mail.

The circumstances of the near-fatal attack on George Harrison in December 1999 are also dubious. At 3:30 a.m., the perpetrator, Michael Abraham, broke into Friar Park, the Harrisons' estate. George, awakened, confronted the intruder. However, his attempt to take Abraham by surprise in order to snatch the knife from him failed.

As a result, Abraham stabbed the ex-Beatle several times. He then proceeded to go after Harrison's wife, who was, however, able to break free and hide. After fifteen minutes, the police arrived at the scene and arrested the attacker. He stated as the motive for the crime, analogous to Mark David Chapman, the murderer of John Lennon, that he had heard voices in his head that motivated him to the attack. Harrison survived. Seriously injured.

"I think we are being led by maniacs, for maniacal ends. And I think I'm liable to be put away as insane for expressing that. That's what's insane about it." (John Winston Lennon)

Like Mark David Chapman, Michael Abraham was an unstable personality, suffering from mental health problems in the run-up to the crime, using drugs and repeatedly in contact with law enforcement. After just 19 months of inpatient treatment in a psychiatric hospital, Abraham was again set free, in 2002.

It is noteworthy that the knife attack on Harrison took place only 24 hours after a conversation between Harrison and Ringo Starr, the drummer of the Beatles, in which Harrison apparently announced that he wanted to put an end to the secrecy surrounding the Beatles, especially the rumors about Paul, and

go public with the truth. George Harrison never commented on the subject again afterwards.

This, of course, is grist to the mill of those Beatles fans who think Paul McCartney is a double and that there's something "fishy." And as abstruse as such a theory may seem, there are indeed indications that put the scenario at least within the realm of possibility. For example, the fact that McCartney spent nine days in the local drug prison during a visit to Japan in 1980. And not because he had a bag of marijuana in his luggage when he entered the country, but because the Japanese authorities were unable to verify the fingerprints of the music legend.

They were different from those McCartney had given in the 1960s, when he toured Japan with the Beatles and also had contact with the police. It was not until the intervention of the British government that McCartney was able to leave Japan on January 25, 1980. Without any legal consequences, despite the not inconsiderable amount of weed in their luggage, for which mere mortals in Japan spend at least seven years behind bars. Up until a few years ago, an informative article about this incident, written by a Tokyo daily newspaper, could still be found on the internet. However, the article has since been scrubbed from the net.

In this context, the results of Italian forensic scientists, which were published in *Wired Magazine* in 2009, are also puzzling. Biometric data and the scientific evaluation of photos from different periods led the two researchers to conclude that there were at least two people who appeared as Paul McCartney over time.

A 2019 study by the University of Naples (Italy) came to similar conclusions, which noted a clear difference in Paul McCartney's style during the creative phases before and after the album *Sgt.*

Pepper's Lonely Hearts Club Band—the period in which the doppelganger is said to have taken over the direction.

The story of a paternity lawsuit pending against "Macca" in Germany seems similarly confusing. *SPIEGEL* reported on this on May 21, 2007, as did the *FAZ* and the British newspaper *The Telegraph*. Paul McCartney was accused of denying paternity to a child conceived out of wedlock in Hamburg in the early 1960s. He was also accused of having given false DNA samples in the first trial in this regard, which took place in the 1980s and was decided in his favor.

According to recent research results, the signature on the relevant documents came from a right-handed person—while Paul is known to write and play the guitar with his left hand.

The plaintiff, who was 46 years old at the time, also told the *BILD* newspaper that Paul had made a one-time payment of 30,000 Deutschmarks to her mother in 1966 as compensation and hush money—and had subsequently instructed her to pay two hundred Deutschmarks per month as alimony for many years.

The public prosecutor's office began an investigation. But the case was dropped in 2007. Because even if the crime should have taken place, according to justice spokesman Michael Grundwald, it is now statute-barred. The question arises as to why the mother brought an action for paternity in the first place if she could assume that a DNA test would be carried out as part of the taking of evidence, according to which it would be possible to determine beyond doubt whether she was telling the truth?

The same applies to the more recent lawsuit of the mother of the child. Considering her approach, one must actually assume

that she and her mother seriously assumed that they would ultimately be able to decide the lawsuits in their favor. Because the real Paul would have to have his genetic material tested. Consequently, McCartney's DNA sample from the 1980s, which did not match the DNA of the disputed offspring, was actually "fake." In other words, the DNA did not come from the Paul with whom the woman from Hamburg had been intimate between 1959 and 1962, or the Paul offering the DNA for testing is not the same Paul from before. Or the plaintiff was not in full possession of her mental faculties when she went to the prosecutor's office.

It would be interesting to know what Paul McCartney's ex-wife Heather Mills was talking about live on US television when she told of *"truths beyond the imaginable*" in relation to her former husband. Truths that are so "*shocking that the world can't bear them*." Mills also reported that she had deposited relevant documents and evidence with third parties in order to protect herself and her family from Paul and his entourage. She also makes it emphatically clear that these truths are not marital affairs or similarly common rock star scandals. Of course, this makes you curious.

Similar stories abound if you follow the more than sixty-year history of the most successful band of all time. And new books and documentaries on the subject are still being published. Most recently, for example, *Faul—The Musical* or the ominous book series *The Memoirs of Billy Shears*, written by the equally ominous author Thomas E. Uharriet, who otherwise seems to be primarily concerned with the subject of haiku.

How he came to put himself in the role of Paul's doppelganger years ago—or, if there is one, managed to get hold of his secret information—is a mystery. Wikipedia even has a dedicated

discussion forum on the topic of "Paul is Dead." So far, however, even this has not been able to provide certainty.

So the doubting Beatles fan will probably have to continue to live with the nagging uncertainty of whether it is the real Paul McCartney who continues to tour tirelessly around the world or whether Paul has been impersonated since 1967 by Vivian Stanshell, William Campbell, Phil Ackrill of Denny Laine and The Diplomats, Bill Shepherd, or Billy Shears of Billy Pepper and The Pepperpots, all of whom are popular suspects among "Paul is Dead" nerds.

How the aforementioned candidates accomplish it or managed to continue their own lives parallel to the portrayal of the busy Beatle is unfortunately left open by the corresponding theories.

However, there are some things that you may not want to explore in more detail and instead, as in the present case, simply settle for the shimmering illusion, the end result, the art. Because the timeless quality of the music does not suffer in any way from the potentially dark spots in the band's history or supposed manipulations from the deep state background.

"Life is what happens while you're planning."
(John Winston Lennon)

After the break-up of the Beatles, it was Paul McCartney who was the first former band member to release his solo album of the same name. He had already worked on it during the recordings of *Abbey Road*, which caused additional upsets in the band structure at the time.

John had also been working on new music with his wife Yoko Ono in 1968 and 1969 and had begun to emancipate himself from

his band, but it was only after the last Beatles album and McCartney that he released his first solo album. The album, entitled *John Lennon/Plastik Ono Band*, was hailed by many critics as the most honest rock record of all time.

After years of touring stress, Beatlemania and many bad experiences with the dark side of the music industry, Lennon was tired of staged publicity, image design, appointments and marketing. He was searching, for himself and for the meaning of life and truth. Soon after reaching world star status, the introverted and melancholic free spirit had recognized the true character of the greed-based feudal system, which sought to exploit him commercially and ideologically as a product, as a rock star, youth idol and peace activist—and later to eliminate him.

John's solo debut features the magnificent title "Working Class Hero," probably the best (political) song or lyric of all time, at least from my perspective.

There are several reasons for this strong statement. On the one hand, the piece is musically very simple and therefore easy to learn even for guitar novices. The chord progression consists primarily of A minor and G major and changes to D major for only one line of the chorus. This gives the song a better chance of being distributed quickly. In addition, the vocals are not very complex and invite you to sing along. After a few passes, you will be able to repeat the lines by heart, even without musical accompaniment. On the other hand—and much more importantly—the text can be interpreted universally. For every person in this world.

In other words, everyone who lives in a society shaped by capitalism will be able to identify with the "Working Class Hero" in

their own individual way. And not just in a single line, in the one, outstanding metaphor or a stand-alone catchphrase—but in the entire text, which traces the life of a working-class person in the neo-feudalist-corrupt system of our time in an exemplary and open to interpretation.

From birth to the peak of your career. Each line immediately creates an image in the mind, evoking childhood memories and recalling them. This is what makes the verses written by John Lennon at the end of 1970 so powerful and the emotions triggered by the piece so overwhelming.

"You don't need anyone to tell you who or what you are. You are what you are!" (John Winston Lennon)

The listener automatically projects his own life path, subjective experiences, personal memories and forgotten feelings into the lyrics performed by the ex-Beatle in a calm voice. John Lennon takes the listener on a journey through his own past, meaning, that of the teenager from Liverpool who grew up with his aunt—and that of the listener alike. He exposes the school system as indoctrination, and after that, the world of work as modern serfdom. And distills that information into a handful of syllables. This is high art. Writing complex, cerebral texts is comparatively simple. Behind the simplicity, memorability and universal adaptability of a song, beyond one's own reality, one's own culture and one's own era, lies the path to a masterpiece.

The astonishing to depressing thing about the lyrics of "Working Class Hero" is that the lyrics have not lost a bit of their topicality to this day. More than half a century after the evocative title was adopted, Homo consumens is still a slave to its fears.

And on top of that, more than ever, it is a plaything of system-inherent incapacitation and dehumanization, of expropriation processes, ideological power struggles and imposed military-industrial hegemonic interests. These fascistic tendencies—almost linearly following George Orwell's dystopia *1984*—were obviously already clearly foreseeable for Lennon in the 1970s, as various interviews with the musician and peace activist from that time prove.

Even then, the politicized Beatle criticized the perfidious, geopolitical castling of the leading power blocs USA, Russia and China. Furthermore, it was absolutely clear to the Liverpool man that the mafia-like state's monopoly on the use of force could not be overcome by force. That resistance and revolution only have a chance if the protest breaks out peacefully.

> **"When it comes to the point where you have to use force, you play the game of the system. The establishment will provoke you (...) to make you fight. Because once they've made you violent, they know how to deal with you. The only thing they can't handle is non-violence and humor." (John Winston Lennon)**

For his peace campaigns, he relied on slogans such as "Give Peace a Chance" or "War Is Over If You Want It," on high-profile "Bed-ins for Peace" with Yoko, on artistic freedom and humor—especially in dealing with the dark forces of the deep state, which in turn did everything in their power to drive Lennon out of the United States as quickly as possible, a country he had chosen as his adopted home after the dissolution of his first band. "Working Class Hero" caused headaches in the US establishment right at the beginning of Lennon's stay in America in 1971.

Although the song had already been released a year earlier. Senators and officials complained about the play's vulgar language and subversive, anti-state tone. The radio stations played it anyway. With a few exceptions, who supported the state's call for a boycott.

Just four months after "Working Class Hero," in March 1971, John's single "Power to the People" was released. This was closely followed by his best-known peace anthem—"Imagine"—in October 1971. This definitively underscored the direction John was taking, in terms of content, and earned the ex-Beatle a place at the very bottom of the US establishment.

The American authorities left no stone unturned to torpedo the British musician's naturalization application. Meanwhile, "Imagine" became the most successful song of his solo career. More than 200 artists have reinterpreted it to date. The track is one of the 100 most played songs of all time and was ranked number 30 in the Recording Industry Association of America's (RIAA) list of Songs of the Century.

John Lennons message was unstoppable.

"Ideas don't need weapons if they can convince the masses." (Fidel Castro)

After the release of his big hit single, John Lennon had only nine years to live. During the first half of it he drank a lot, took drugs and didn't really know what to do with himself. From 1975 to 1980, he primarily cared for his son Sean, the only child with Yoko. Asked what he had been doing since the mid-1970s, he replied in an interview: "*Baked bread and looked after the baby*." And just as he had started working on new songs, inspired by a stormy sailing trip to Bermuda, his story was to come to an abrupt

and dramatic end. Presumably, his mass-mobilizing pacifism and vociferous criticism of the Vietnam War ultimately proved to be his undoing.

On December 8, 1980, around eleven o'clock at night, the then 40-year-old Lennon was shot dead in front of the entrance to New York's Dakota Building. By Mark David Chapman, a confused lone perpetrator, according to the official account. After Lennon's cremation, Yoko Ono scattered his ashes in nearby Central Park. The Imagine Memorial, which is always littered with flowers, letters and devotional objects, is now located there. His murderer, on the other hand, is alive. And at regular intervals he submits applications for release from prison.

In 2020, his eleventh parole request was denied. The next hearing will take place in August 2022. Presumably with a similar result. Yoko Ono lodges an objection to the application every two years.

The prevailing opinion about Chapman's motive for the crime was and is that he shot to become famous—as a celebrity killer.

This argument does not really hold water in light of Chapman's confession. Because if he had sought publicity, he would have followed the advice of his lawyer and gone into the criminal trial, which is likely to cause a sensation worldwide. TV coverage at prime time included. However, his immediate admission of guilt did not lead to a show trial. Chapman went straight to jail. He also generally held back on interviews and other options for getting attention.

During a TV interview with Larry King in 1992, twelve years after the murder, Chapman tried to describe his motives, to narrow down the trigger for the act. His explanations did not seem

logical. The rationale for his actions remained vague. It seemed that he himself was still looking for answers. Or doesn't tell the whole story—maybe can't tell it. And he doesn't even have to lie, as research by US author Phil Strongman on the Mark David Chapman case reveals.

In his book *John Lennon: Life, Times and Assassination*, published in 2010, he examines the obvious contradictions regarding the course of events, the nebulous past of the alleged lone perpetrator, his motives and, above all, the striking negligence of the United States authorities during the investigation of the assassination.

Strongman focuses on exactly those questions that the FBI would have had to ask if the United States had been genuinely interested in solving the violent crime, yet which the country had avoided raising as much as possible.

For example, who is Chapman, the "nobody," as he calls himself, from a small town in Georgia? Why is he commonly portrayed as a Lennon and Beatles fanatic? Not a single record, book, newspaper clipping or other material about the Beatles was found in his apartment. What prompted Chapman to fly from his home in Hawaii to New York in the days leading up to the murder?

And what did he do during the logistically unnecessary stopover at the Chicago airport? Why did Chapman live in Hawaii in the first place, close to a CIA training camp? What exactly did he do for his employer, World Vision International, an organization founded in 1950 that is said to be one of countless CIA shadow companies?

Why was Chapman in Beirut, a CIA stronghold during the Cold War? Why were all the bullet holes on the left side of John Lennon's body if Mark David Chapman was standing behind him to the right

when he fired? How was Chapman able to aim so accurately that the doctors had trouble removing the bullets that were almost on top of each other during the autopsy?

According to a court report, this is a ballistic masterpiece—and highly unlikely for non-professionals. Especially from the wrong angle. Why were experts excluded from the investigations who assumed that there were several shooters?

Why didn't anyone take a closer look at the security guard of the Dakota Building, José Sanjenís Perdomo, who was on duty at the time of the crime? Perdomo had demonstrably worked for the American secret service as a professional killer and hired as a mercenary for the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba. After the shooting of Lennon, why was Perdomo able to calmly approach Chapman and take the loaded gun out of his hand, completely without any resistance from the shooter? Wouldn't the natural reaction in such a moment of shock be to take cover in the guardhouse at the entrance to the Dakota Building, or to return fire on Chapman? For what reason was Perdomo not afraid that Chapman would point the gun at him and pull the trigger?

Was it because Perdomo and Chapman had been strolling about together outside the entrance of the Dakota all evening, talking about the Bay of Pigs or the assassination of John F. Kennedy, until Lennon showed up just before 11:00 p.m.?

"*José Perdomo told the police that Chapman was Lennon's murderer. One of the arresting officers, Peter Cullen, did not believe that Chapman had shot Lennon. Cullen believed the shooter was a handyman in the Dakota building, but Perdomo convinced Cullen that it was Chapman.* (Latin News Agency, December 8, 2018)

In addition, the imperative of the criminal multiplication table always applies: Follow the money! So how did Chapman, who never had a steady job, a good income, or anything like a career, finance himself? Where did the man with odd jobs get the money for his above-average lifestyle? Who paid for Chapman's six-week trip around the world in 1978—and what was he doing in Tokyo, Seoul, Hong Kong, Singapore, Bangkok, New Delhi, Geneva, London, Paris and Dublin? Perhaps the most important question: Why did Chapman stand paralyzed at the scene of the crime after the shooting of Lennon? As if he had just woken up from a dream. Passers-by and patrol police describe his behavior as that of a mindless zombie. Disoriented and confused—by himself and his surroundings. Where was his flight reflex? Why didn't he run away? Also, why wasn't Chapman subjected to a drug test? Why was it ignored that Chapman spoke of voices in his head vehemently urging him to "do it" before the shooting?

Or that he described himself as remembering the time of the crime as if it were "two different films"—one in the minutes before the gun was fired, which made him nervous, stirred, emotionally corrupted; and one after pulling the trigger, which he describes as quiet, empty, meaningless and paralyzing? Chapman stated that in the minutes after the crime, he felt as if he had been torn out of a deep sleep, out of a dream.

All these questions were not clarified in the course of the official investigation. Corresponding FBI files are still under lock and key to this day. Top-Secret. National security and stuff. We know this from the assassination of John F. Kennedy. However, in view of the above facts, it does not take much imagination to imagine what actually happened in New York on December 8, 1980. Especially if you have researched the illegal, disturbing MKULTRA, MKNAOMI,

MKOFT, MKCHICKWIT, CHATTER or ARTICHOKE programs of the US intelligence agencies.

The goal of these despicable human experiments: mind manipulation. The creation of subconsciously acting killers that can be activated from the normal state by trigger signal and moved to action. The methods: LSD, electric shocks, psychological torture, sleep deprivation, verbal and physical violence. Anyone who assumes that such ideas are only suitable as material for a nice spy flick is mistaken.

For example, a declassified CIA report from 1975 states:

"*If hypnosis has been successful, assassins can be created to assassinate a prominent (..) to assassinate a politician or, if necessary, an American official.*"

Stephen Kinzer, who has long investigated the secret CIA projects, wrote in his book *Poisoner in Chief*, published in September 2019:

"*In the early 1950s, the CIA set up secret detention centers in American-controlled areas in Europe and East Asia. Mainly in Japan, Germany and the Philippines. (...)*
The CIA captured people suspected of being enemy agents as well as other people whom it considered expendable to carry out various types of torture and human experimentation on them. The detainees were interrogated while being administered psychoactive drugs, given electric shocks and subjected to extreme temperatures. They have been subjected to sensory isolation and the like in order to develop a better understanding of how to destroy and control the human mind."

In *Programmed to Kill* (2004), author David McGowan also uses numerous original sources to describe how US intelligence agencies breed sleepers. So, if you still believe in the myth that the state is your friend, you should perhaps reconsider that belief now. After all, the list of unethical human experiments is long. Many of them have been astonishingly "successful," if you want to call it that. But there are no scruples at the top of the food chain.

That's where you learn to smile when you're killing. This is exactly what John Lennon describes with his last line in "Working Class Hero"—"*First you must learn how to smile as you kill.*" So maybe Mark David Chapman was a Manchurian candidate, or just the useful idiot. Or both.

In any case, the circumstantial evidence gives every reason to believe that it is the United States government that has the Beatles founder on its conscience. Because it could not get him out of the country by legal means and became increasingly afraid of his ability to turn the masses against the ruling system. Peacefully, but determined. With love, humor and creativity.

Fortunately, his death did not silence him. The opposite is true. Because John Winston Lennon became more immortal through the assassination than he already was as a member of the most successful band of all time.

Not a martyr—but a hero of the working class whose ideas and ideals will stand the test of time. Imagine Peace.

August 20, 2022

Working Class Hero (John Lennon, 1971)

As soon as you're born, they make you feel small,
By giving you no time instead of it all,
Till the pain is so big you feel nothing at all.
A working class hero is something to be,
A working class hero is something to be.

They hurt you at home and they hit you at school,
They hate you if you're clever and they despise a fool,
Till you're so fucking crazy you can't follow their rules.
A working class hero is something to be,
A working class hero is something to be.

When they've tortured and scared you for twenty odd years,
Then they expect you to pick a career,
When you can't really function, you're so full of fear.
A working class hero is something to be,
A working class hero is something to be.

Keep you doped with religion and sex and TV,
And you think you're so clever and classless and free,
But you're still fucking peasants as far as I can see.
A working class hero is something to be,
A working class hero is something to be.

There's room at the top they are telling you still,
But first you must learn how to smile as you kill,
If you want to be like the folks on the hill.
A working class hero is something to be.
A working class hero is something to be.

If you want to be a hero well just follow me,
If you want to be a hero well just follow me

Overheated Cultural Revolution

"The really frightening thing about totalitarianism is not that it commits massacres, but that it attacks the concept of objective truth. It pretends to control the past as well as the future." (George Orwell)

The hot weeks of the year are once again used for performative politics. Natural gas emergency, climate apocalypse, Covid collateral damage, wars, followed by an anticipated winter of anger in dark Germany. The result: paternalism, prohibitions, scarcity and authoritarianism. It is a cacophony of crises as a lever for the creeping implementation of technocratic neo-feudalism.

Some hot summer days are behind us. Although not quite as hot as Germany's public broadcaster would like to make its viewers believe by means of manipulatively colored weather maps, it was quite warm. It's the height of summer. Holiday season. Everyone is on the go, and many might be travelling for the first time since the Covid emergency regime was declared. Because as recently as March, the impression arose that 2022 could be a relatively carefree summer. Many neighboring countries ended the restrictive pandemic measures, abolished Covid certificates and mandatory masks. In Switzerland, the Federal Office of Public Health (FOPH) advised people to uninstall the local Covid app on their smartphones as early as March. And in Germany, too,

the regent caste held out the prospect of an end to all measures. What happened next is well known.

Not only did our "chaos team" really pick up speed again in Berlin and continues to bully the population incessantly with senseless symbolic politics and preventive paternalism in terms of health protection, the Ukraine conflict also gained momentum. Reports about this apparently long-planned US proxy war against Russia replaced the pandemic news tickers from one day to the next. Mask and syringe emojis have been replaced by blue and yellow flags on social media platforms without reflection. Regardless of the fact that Ukraine is controlled by a corrupt Nazi regime and, in general, any war is to be condemned.

It doesn't matter who runs it—because it's normal people like you and me who have to die. Not the people who unleash it out of arrogance, self-interest, geopolitical interests or greed. At the same time, the destructive effects of the sanctions regime against Putin's superpower in the east, which was subsequently implemented by the West, are only just beginning to take hold.

Months after expressing unconditional solidarity with Kiev, we are seeing galloping inflation, a loss of purchasing power, unforeseen price increases and a home-made gas crisis, which are visibly dampening the summer mood. Worries about the future determine the everyday life of many people. Fear.

At the same time, in Washington, the United States imperialists of the military-industrial complex are leaving no stone unturned to escalate the conflict with China, which has been smoldering for some time. Just after the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, Nancy Pelosi, who for some unknown reason has a private fortune of 100 to 200 million US dollars—depending on

which source you follow—already caused a diplomatic scandal with the Middle Kingdom on August 2, 2022 with her surprise visit to Taiwan, the next group of American political actors to Taipei jetted off in mid-August. This time, it was a delegation from the United States Congress led by the Democratic Senator from Massachusetts, Ed Markey.

These political provocations in the direction of Beijing are accompanied by military maneuvers in the disputed Taiwan Strait.

In the coming weeks, the United States intends to increase its air and naval forces there. Meanwhile, the strategic simulations of the United States military, its think tanks and demagogues for a hot war in the Asia-Pacific region are in full swing—ranging from the scenario of a short preemptive strike against China to the long-term defense of Taiwan to a full-blown nuclear war in the Western Pacific.

In addition, the globally networked interpretive elite is increasingly trying to "nudge" the narrative of the climate emergency into the minds of the population and the socio-economic structures of the country.

Whether it's a low water level in the Rhine or heated asphalt at the Tour de France, the monocausal worldview of the "Woko Haram" acknowledges only one reason: climate change. That the roads at the Tour de France have always been cooled with water due to high temperatures is evidently beside the point.

It is for this reason that the weather maps of Germany's publicly funded mainstream media now look as if lava is flowing through the streets. Reports of summer forest fires are also referred to as "spontaneous combustion," and power outages are attributed to

cables melted together by the sun. No degree of nudging seems too abstruse. No straw man argument too illogical. No absurdity too embarrassing. After all, hardly anyone reads the numerous corrections which the mainstream media publishes a few days after it unfurls its panic headlines.

There is also cause for concern with regard to the general food supply in the coming winter. In the United States, for example, more than 20 food processing factories have burned down during the year.

According to reports from the Reuters news agency, this is of course pure coincidence. However, this undoubtedly exacerbates the strained situation caused by worn out supply chains. The deliberate flaring of wheat fields by the Ukrainian military is, too, escalating.

Meanwhile, supranational corporatism is cheerfully taking advantage of the cacophony of the crisis and acquiring all the agricultural land available.

Microsoft founder Bill Gates became the largest landowner in the United States within a very short time. Corporations such as Cargill, Dupont and Monsanto, whose largest shareholders are the capital collection agencies Blackrock, Vanguard and Blackstone, have meanwhile bought up 1.7 million hectares of fertile farmland in Ukraine.

The real estate market is no different. Thus, economic crisis profiteers and politicians are not only using the 2022 summer slump to advance their performative agenda as unnoticed as possible, but the numerous trouble spots are also fueling this fiscal robbery of the financial elites.

The ruling caste's complete abandonment of the idea of the common good has hardly ever been more obvious. It is nothing new that governments always use the hot months of the year to rush controversial or unpopular decisions through parliament. On the other hand, the fact that the holiday season serves to whip up a "woke" cultural revolution is remarkable. For example, plans to deploy the Bundeswehr for domestic missions from October 1, 2022 to support the police in maintaining public order are only a disturbing symptom of the continuously ailing system. Dam bursts and paradigm shifts now seem to be the order of the day.

> **"We are now entering a phase where the state of emergency will be the norm." (Karl Lauterbach)**

This is likely to be one of the few prophecies issued by panic preacher in the Ministry of Health that will come true.

Even *BILD* boss Claus Strunz now warns that Habeck and company are just waiting to declare a climate lockdown. Against this background, the dark green cultural revolutionaries will find it rather convenient that Olaf Scholz is currently coming under fire again because of the CumEx scandal. More than fifty times, the SPD financial lobbyist is said to have stated before the corresponding investigative committee that he could not remember anything. This evokes memories of mafia trials.

Should the apparently corrupt Chancellor have to take his hat, it would probably be Robert Habeck's turn as Vice Chancellor. And that does not bode well, as the dogmatic Maoist's current plans for energy saving prove. After all, the postulated "*winter of rage*" is likely to find its way into a dystopian looking "*dark Germany*" at Habeck's discretion.

The prospect of state encroachments due to the instrumentalized energy crisis is likely to even exceed those of the Covid regime. For example, public buildings are not to be heated up more than 19 degrees. If physical work is performed, 12 degrees must suffice. Shop doors and entrances have to be closed shut, and billboards and neon signs be switched off from 10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m.

The façade lighting of public buildings and monuments is completely prohibited. And the streetlights are also to be switched off temporarily or in clusters. Although this could have a negative impact on the sense of security of one's own population, especially in large cities, problem districts or urban parks. This is how you create new spaces of fear.

After establishing a precedent with the totalitarian Covid measures, the state's paternalism is, of course, not limited to the public space. In the private sphere, too, it is to be checked whether citizens adhere to centralist requirements. So far, it has only been officially decided that private pools may no longer be heated with gas or electricity—but the first voices calling for strict control of energy consumption in private homes are already being heard.

Even if such plans are currently vehemently denied by all sides, the experience of the past two and a half years shows that media test balloons of this kind are not let loose without reason.

This also applies to Olaf Scholz's recent statements that no one intends to shoot at demonstrators in the coming winter. Because the accusation that he could have erased this promise from memory until a few months from now does not seem too far-fetched in light of his selective amnesia regarding the CumEx scandal. Thus, the outrageous gas levy, unique in its design in the world, is to be seen as another piece of the puzzle of an inhuman

panopticon of creative destruction, to which civilization is exposed by neo-feudal circles.

Once again, this is implied by the organizational background. As luck would have it, the main beneficiary of the financial injection for the energy industry is the Düsseldorf-based company Uniper. It had already received financial aid of 15 billion euros from the German state in July 2022. Uniper is 56 percent owned by the Finnish energy group Fortum.

WEF favorite and board member Philipp Rösler, who is former FDP Federal Chairman and Vice-Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, sits on its supervisory board. This circumstance is a prime example of the now openly celebrated systematics of corporatism, whose singular goal is the privatization and monopolization of all available resources to maintain the power of an international financial elite.

This goal is criminal at its core. To achieve this, organized crime is needed. And institutionalized redistribution of assets.

This was also confirmed, seemingly subconsciously, by the kitchen worker and full-time green ideologue Katrin Göring-Eckardt when she unceremoniously announced on Twitter in August 2022 :

"*We need redistribution from the bottom to the top, not the other way around.*"

In the meantime, she has deleted this wording, which was dismissed as a clumsy typo, and reworded the telling sentence for a new article—but such a potential Freudian slip may be profound. Anyone who secretly assumes that corporatist—and thus fascist—structures do not exist in the supposedly democratic Federal

Republic of Germany will be taught otherwise by the Federal Agency for Civic Education. With an article dated May 26, 2002, entitled (translated) "The Development of German Corporatism."

In any case, the criminal interweaving of the state and corporations with regard to the gas crisis shows once again that in the technocratic corporatism of the imposed turning point, it is irrelevant where on the political spectrum the representatives happen to be. Whether left, green, liberal, conservative or right-wing—when it comes to power and money, the "public-private partnerships" of supranationally constituted "global governance" are pulling in the same direction. The one from which the rope of the liberally organized civil society is slowly but surely being twisted.

August 21, 2022

Homo demens

"Every nation has the government it deserves."
(Joseph de Maistre)

In Germany, this apparently means a government that is absolutely indifferent to what the population knows, votes for or wants. A government whose dark green foreign minister, Annalena Baerbock, announced at a panel discussion of Forum 2000 in Prague on August 31, 2022, that she would maintain her abstruse course on the Ukraine crisis, "*no matter what her German voters think.*"

A government whose chancellor suffers from selective amnesia when it comes to investigating the CumEx scandal, the most massive case of tax evasion in German history. An administration with a chancellor whose CumEx accomplices and former party comrades have deposited 200,000 euros from unknown sources in safe deposit boxes, who, as Senator of the Interior of Hamburg, decreed that suspected drug dealers be tortured with emetics, as a result of which the 19-year-old Cameroonian Achidi J. died.

A head of government who also refuses any transparency in the corruption scandal surrounding Wirecard and whose brother—Jens Scholz, chairman of the board of the University Medical Center Schleswig-Holstein and Leopoldina member—profited millions from the intensive care bed fraud during the Covid crisis.

The Germans seem to deserve a government whose sociophobic-seeming health minister sometimes feudalistically replies to justified questions about the mask-gate that has recently caused a stir: "*That's just the way it is.*"

A coalition with a health minister who is more involved in pharmaceutical lobbying than politics.

To such an extent that even the tame Markus Lanz of ZDF recently commented smugly after a speech by Karl Lauterbach—"*So much for the advertising block for Paxlovid*"—after he had previously reasoned extensively about the greatness of the product. Pfizer, the manufacturer of the new Covid drug, and one of the most criminal corporations in the world, sponsored—quite incidentally—the SPD party congress on December 11, 2021, as well as various other events of local top politics.

A government corrupted by hegemonic powers, which does not provide any money for the flood victims in the Ahr Valley, but instead finances US proxy wars or Bundeswehr missions in Mali and distributes millions of tax dollars abroad with full hands.

A government whose FDP minister of the interior promised to lift the pandemic measures and ordered the exact opposite. A government that, due to its obligations to supranational interest groups, implements technocratic control structures, destroys the middle class, expropriates the citizens via a home-made energy crisis, thus provoking a winter of anger in dark Germany, but prophylactically defames potential and completely justified protests against this inhuman corporatism as "delegitimization of the state."

Indicative of the aloof arrogance of the regent caste these days is a statement by Sigmar Gabriel—former SPD leader as well as

vice chancellor and current chairman of the oligarch network Atlantikbrücke, founded in 1952 by US bankers—who rushed to Annalena Baerbock's side in the media shitstorm regarding her statements in Prague, and who disavows the outraged voters by writing on September 2, 2022:

"*I don't know if Baerbock's quote is true. But those who are artificially upset here should read Article 38 (1) of the Constitution. Members of parliament are only bound by their conscience and not by the will of the voters.*"

If one follows the logic of the representative of the Counter-Enlightenment quoted at the beginning, Joseph de Maistre, this anonymous mass of voters, to whom no one is beholden, deserves to be ignored, ridiculed, economically destroyed and subjugated by their supposed representatives of the people. After all, the vote of the Bundestag election legitimizes the current incumbents to rule over the voting cattle. It's your own fault, you might say.

But this argument falls short. The view that the population itself bears responsibility for the misery neglects the fact that only plague and cholera are always up for selection in elections.

No fundamental changes of direction or new ideas. Moreover, this argumentative position ignores the fact that only a small proportion of people today are familiar with alternative forms of organization, society and government—in other words, alternatives to the ruling system—which makes dysfunctional representative democracy seem to have no alternative.

Furthermore, this "self-blame rhetoric" implies that citizens followed their free will when they went to the polls. That as

sovereigns with informed participation, they shape their own destiny and are living autonomously.

And last but not least, that people are provided with all relevant tools, processes and information that contribute to objective and critical political decision-making, because this forms the foundation of every freely organized civil society.

But is that so? Don't the monopolistic structures of the media landscape, the corporatist interweaving of the state, corporate cartels and NGOs, as well as the development of the education system in recent decades suggest the opposite? That an interpretive elite has established itself that uses all means to gain supremacy over the debate space? That the state apparatus, corporations, the digital economy and questionably funded NGOs are trying to withhold relevant and explosive information?

That public discourse is usurped, controlled, curated and massively censored? That the scientific community has long since become so permeated, infiltrated and dependent on subsidies that it has de facto degenerated into government science?

And that children in the state school and education system have long since ceased to be prepared to shape a self-determined existence that takes into account their personal abilities and preferences? That they are not encouraged and empowered to take responsibility for themselves, their ideas and their actions?

Modern serfdom in a large corporation, economic security and social acceptance are preached to the next generation as ideals. In other words, conformism and dependence. In this way, children do not become creative, informed, motivated, characterful,

courageous democrats and entrepreneurs, but intimidated, dependent and horizonless followers.

As a consequence of these circumstances, modern man may no longer be able to take his destiny into his own hands and to live informed, democratic participation. Because of systemic devolution processes, Homo *consumens* has long since reached the stage of an externally controlled, unconscious immaturity. A Homo *demens*.

Yes, he has created the increasingly illiberal living conditions in the habitat of his post-factual, value-based Western façade democracy. This, however, with the limited means that the system offers him and presents suggestively as a totality of options.

Can the overtaxed man of postmodernity still take responsibility for the status quo if he hardly seems to be aware that even with the ancient Greeks, representative democracy was only a clever means of maintaining the power of the elites, because resistance from the oppressed population constantly endangered their power structures and was simply a costly undertaking in the long run?

Can one assume self-fault when decisions are made in financial, cultural and ideological dependence, without the presence of self-confidence—in the literal sense of the word—without basic information, without knowledge of alternatives and the mental abilities to be able to think outside the box? When his education restricts horizons and is degraded to indoctrination?

This is an excellent topic for philosophical debate. Not about the fact that elitist circles have been trying for centuries, or millennia, to manipulate the masses for the singular goal of maintaining power. That should be indisputable. Historically, these efforts

gained new momentum at the time when the mass media began to grow in importance.

One could look back, for context, to the initial spark of this development, the invention of the printing press. A corresponding analysis entitled “The Gutenberg Conspiracy” was published by journalist James Corbett on July 18, 2022. For deconstructivist postmodernism, however, the history of electronic mass media—radio, TV and the internet—is of particular importance.

The 30th of October 1938 is an example of the unprecedented effects of the omnipresence of the media.

The day when millions of radio listeners panicked because the radio play “War of the Worlds” by Orson Welles was broadcast on the radio—and they could no longer distinguish reality from fiction. They succumbed to the fallacy that Earth was actually being invaded by aliens and behaved as irrationally as is to be expected from people in fear of death.

This new phenomenon immediately attracted the attention of the rich and powerful. This is because they recognized the possibilities associated with technological development for the efficient manipulation of large sections of the population. The Rockefeller clan had the events analyzed in detail by social scientists.

The super-rich oligarch family had been financing controversial activities such as eugenics since 1913, and from 1918 at the latest also projects in the field of “social engineering,” and has played a fundamental role in the further development of associated branches of research, which are now euphemistically marketed as “biosocial science” or “bioethics.”

In addition, the Rockefellers, the planet's first billionaire family, set the tone in the creation of supranational institutions such as the United Nations (UN), Chatham House, the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) or the Trilateral Commission.

Of course, this globalist élan is perfectly complemented by the intention to control the masses via media and manipulative-invasive technologies. Especially if you indulge in neo-feudal fantasies of world power.

At the same time, this underscores the early history of television as the dominant mass medium of the past 70 years. While in 1946 only a few thousand households in the United States owned a television set, hardly a critical mass, influential circles of the Anglo-American establishment were already concerned with the question of how this new technology could be used to manipulate the population in the future.

First and foremost, the British Broadcasting Company (BBC), which conducted various experiments with hypnosis in the course of 1946. In December 1946, a large number of newspapers in the English-speaking world reported on these events.

An article initially written by the Associated Press can be found in multiple versions, sometimes shorter, sometimes longer, in *The Lewiston Daily Sun*, *The Baltimore Sun*, *The San Francisco Examiner* or the *Tallahassee Democrat*. For about a week, the BBC experiments, carried out by professional hypnotist Peter Casson, were a hot topic on both sides of the pond.

The corresponding articles are still available in various newspaper archives. The book *Sound and Vision—The History of Broadcasting in the United Kingdom* by Asa Briggs, published in 1979 by Oxford

University Press, also describes the disturbing series of experiments in detail (p. 196, ff).

Disturbing because these experiments were incredibly successful from the start. The subjects fell asleep or sat paralyzed in their chairs. Peter Casson's hypnosis was so strong that he later had to wake some of the subjects up by touching or shaking them with his own hands, unable to bring them out of the hypnosis otherwise. It is also astonishing that even people who did not participate directly in the experiment—in other words, cameramen, sound engineers or technicians—were also hypnotized. Even if they were standing at the other end of the hallway, many yards away from the television set in question. This worked, mind you, without any technical modification of the old tube televisions.

Officially, the BBC stopped these attempts after a short time. The reason given by the broadcaster was that they feared that viewers at home could fall into hypnosis while no one was around to wake them up. Or, in the worst case, that they would fall off their chairs and injure themselves. No mention was made of the exuberant enthusiasm of the financiers in the background, who could already vividly imagine the possibilities in the field of social engineering that George Orwell's propaganda and manipulation machines in *1984* would soon provide them with.

In 1969, the scientist Herbert Krugman, former president of the American Psychological Association (APA), studied the effects of television consumption on the human brain. In order to understand them, it is first necessary to visualize which signals, frequencies and wavelengths are involved, how the brain works with them and how it reacts to the reception of signals of different wavelengths. The so-called alpha, beta and theta waves are crucial for his investigations.

Theta waves (3 to 8 Hz): Mostly occur at dusk. In the time between full consciousness and sleep. Considered the frequency spectrum of the subconscious.

Alpha waves (8 to 12 Hz): This is a resting state of the brain. It is characterized by a calm, alert state, in which, for example, it is easy to learn.

Beta waves (12 to 38 Hz): This is our normal waking consciousness. We are vigilant and actively decide. At the upper end of this frequency band, anxiety arises.

Professional hypnotist Tammie Mohn summarizes Herbert Krugman's findings on her website as follows:

"*According to research, just one minute of watching television can move a person from the beta-wave state to the alpha-wave state. In other words, from an awake, conscious state to a calm brainwave state. Most of the brain's logical functions are switched off during the alpha state.*
What does that mean? Well, hypnosis occurs in the brainwave states of alpha and theta. This means that television can make people much more receptive to suggestions while watching TV or watching TV programming. With the consequence that advertising becomes more effective. (...) Most people are surprised at how many logos they know.
Once we are in a state of hypnosis, it becomes more likely that any suggestions, positive or negative, will affect our subconscious mind and therefore our lives.
Hypnosis uses another tool: emotion. The more emotional a person is, the closer they are to trauma, the more their subconscious is affected. When a person watches a TV show and makes emotional connections with the characters, emotional states of empathy are generated.

So, we can cry when our favorite character gets hurt or dies. And we can feel joy when something wonderful happens to one of the characters. These emotional states contribute to the hypnotic effects of television. It's easy to incorporate the author's opinions or distorted viewpoints into a non-objective pattern.
Subconscious programming can also be achieved through repetition. Seeing the same theme, or message, over and over again can be the equivalent of what we call programming in hypnosis.
Some call it brainwashing. (...) There is one last point to consider. These are the children. Our children are also exposed to television. Usually at a very early age. From birth to the age of seven or eight, all children are in a theta-wave brain state.
In this way, Mother Nature helps protect us as we grow up. Not only do we learn that touching a hot pan hurt, but we also anchor it in our subconscious, so that hot pans automatically trigger a danger reaction in the future. And while it's completely natural for kids to be in this brainwave state, it should definitely make us think twice about what they're watching, as they're exposed to three times the dose of hypnotic effects from TV consumption, so to speak."

Humanity has been exposed to the influence of this manipulative mass medium for more than half a century.

And it doesn't take too much imagination to imagine that the BBC's experiments were not abandoned after their resounding success, but presumably continued to the discreet exclusion of the public and in favor of the ruling caste.

Nowadays, all Samsung TVs actively monitor their viewers. A camera or sensor on the front of the device tracks the silhouettes in the room and stores the movement patterns. The data is automatically forwarded to the corporate headquarters, where it is used to optimize the product.

What optimization means in this context can be imagined on the basis of the information given above.

Now, the family TV at home also had a big advantage—it was stationary. It was turned off and there was silence. Until the mid-1990s, there was even an official closing time, in Germany at least. After a certain time, nothing came. A test image or flicker replaced the transmission from the transmission center. But that's changing rapidly.

The constant exposure to a screen had begun. The introduction of the smartphone in 2007 had much more fatal effects. Because now you had the screen in your pocket and always with you. And as with the large-scale adaptation of television, no one warned civilization about the potentially negative effects of this technological paradigm shift.

We are seeing the effects today.

With the unreflected use of such psychologically invasive technologies, the self-proclaimed crown of creation is obviously not doing itself any favors, as Martin Korte, Professor of Cellular Neurobiology at TU Braunschweig, explains to Chip.de in an interview on July 11, 2019.

For example, the capacity of human working memory has already dropped from fifteen to eleven seconds since the beginning of the massive use of these new technologies. A dramatic shift. In this context, it is significant—and not without a certain irony—that in 2015, just eight years after the market launch of the iPhone, the neologism "smombie," a fusion of smartphone and zombie, was chosen as the youth word of the year by the Langenscheidt publishing house. Telling for the self-perception of the rising generations.

Total digitalization has simply made Homo sapiens dumber. His cognitive abilities regress. He becomes Homo demens. Because he has never learned to deal rationally with this technological quantum leap.

It is not a question of demonizing technological progress per se or falling into revisionism, because just as you can us a hammer to drive a nail into the wall, you could also use it to smash someone's head. So, overall the internet and smartphones are useful tools if used consciously.

Unfortunately, however, people in the digital media age are increasingly becoming slaves to their devices. And the attention economy behind it.

There are good reasons why the tech gurus of the major social media platforms, for example Sean Parker of Facebook, do not use their own developments themselves and forbid their children to use a smartphone.

Thus, at the beginning and in relation to the quotation by Joseph de Maistre, the question arises once again: Does the population now have the government it deserves? Does humanity have the life it deserves? There is every reason to believe that this is not the case.

On closer inspection, the reality of the media age is made up of imposed and perverted values, beliefs, opinions, processes, tools, forms of government, society, economy and life.

It is a dystopian mega-puzzle, the individual pieces of which many people are still able to place in the right place, but whose overall picture unfortunately—and probably intentionally—only very few will ever put together and perceive.

Homo demens has degenerated into the disoriented mass of a system that has narrowed his corridor of movement and that has declared war on its nature.

Thus, on a philosophical level, it can also be argued that people have not been aware of themselves and their environment for a long time. From this position, the human being can no longer make free decisions. All that remains for him are ready-made thought patterns and life plans.

As a result, he can only take partial responsibility for the status quo, as he has never been able to actively influence it. His feudal lords decide what's good for him and for the collective. Never has this hubris of arrogant arrogance on the part of the power elites been more palpable than in the past two and a half years.

And since propaganda, indoctrination and the Cultural Revolution are primarily fueled by the many screens that permanently surround modern man, I will conclude with a piece of advice from Peter Lustig, who died in 2016, who used to conclude his children's show "Löwenzahn" (Dandelion), aired on ZDF and broadcast from 1981 to 2005, as follows:

"*And now—just turn it off.*"

September 14, 2022

I Am the State!

The era of absolutist monarchy ended almost a century ago. And with it, ostensibly, also the secular influence of European royal houses on the newly created, democratic structures—at least that's the common assumption. That this is not really true is shown by a closer look at the machinations of the well-connected dynasties of the high nobility, some of which have existed for a millennium.

The King is dead, long live the King! With this heraldic formula, probably coined in France in 1422, Great Britain is today ushering in a new era. After the death of the 96-year-old Queen, her eldest son is now taking over the throne in the kingdom. A colossal event.

Not only for the inhabitants of the island. According to the British media, half the world's population gathered in front of some screens to watch the funeral ceremonies. More than four billion people. For the funeral of a wealthy monarch whose power apparatus has been exploiting and subjugating considerable parts of the world for centuries.

A large part of the audience is likely to be affected by the brutal imperialism of the British. At least their ancestors. After all, the Commonwealth of Nations is still huge. Almost 2.5 billion people live on the territory of the former Empire, which covers 56 countries. Almost a third of the world's population. And until recently, they were all subordinate to Queen Elizabeth II,

a snobbish monarch who now basks in the benevolent light of posthumous condolences.

Elizabeth II was a scion of the House of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha, one of the most influential families of the high nobility—as was the reigning Belgian King Philippe, whose duties are outlined in an internet encyclopedia as follows:

"*He is a member of the Club of Rome. In 2012 he was a participant in the Bilderberg conference (...). In 1995, Philippe (...) was invested in the Equestrian Order of the Holy Sepulcher of Jerusalem as a Knight of the Grand Cross.*"

This is followed by several other appointments, orders and praises, including in the Vatican *Bulletin*. Then the description of his life's work, which at first seems unspectacular, ends abruptly.

Representative roles, a merely functional royalty, revisionist traditions—this is what it looks like when looking at the curriculum vitae of ex-Prince Charles. But this is deceptive. Because even if the "royals" today all want to give the impression that their area of responsibility is limited to photo shoots, home stories and charity events, the families of the long-established high nobility, who have ruled the European continent for a millennium, still have unimagined power and exert more influence on the course of the world than many *Gala* or *Bunte* readers would like to imagine.

Both the recently defunct Queen and Philip, like various European kings and emperors, can be traced back to noble families of German origin.

In the present case, the House of Wettin. With over 1,000 years of family history, it is one of the oldest documented families of the high nobility.

And there are quite a few of them, as can be looked up in the *Genealogical Handbook of the Nobility*.

The name "Windsor" was only given to the British royal family in 1917 in order to conceal Elizabeth's father's German roots.

In view of the German ancestry of the British royal family and the atrocities committed during the First World War, resentment spread among the British population at the turn of the century. This tendency continued with the later rise of the Nazis to power in Germany and the undisguised sympathy that George VI had for Hitler and his regime.

And for good reason. For the list of "sovereign houses of the first division," in other words the dynasties of reigning or formerly reigning monarchs, may seem somewhat surreal, out of place or ridiculous in the post-fact media age. But behind the surnames lie inherited claims to power, immense might and enormous amounts of old capital, some of which looks back on an entire millennium of political, financial and social influence. After all, the monarchy in Germany was not abolished until the abdication of the Kaiser in 1918.

Nevertheless, according to the results of Germany's third federal forest inventory, for example, a good half of the forest areas in Germany are still privately owned, in the hands of the nobility. In some federal states, such as North Rhine-Westphalia (with 67 percent) or Lower Saxony (with 59 percent), it is significantly higher.

With 300 hectares, a respectable revenue can already be achieved, reports the Prince of Saxe-Weimar, who owns 2,100 hectares of forest and 300 hectares of agriculture, and thus receiving around 1.2 million euros a year. His total assets amount to about 50 million euros, and has been carried through the generations since 1532, the year of the appointment of the first elector of the family.

Compared to the fortunes of the clan of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha residing in Buckingham Palace, these are, of course, only peanuts.

The Bloomberg Billionaires Index estimated Queen Elizabeth II's personal wealth at $425 million in 2015. Almost half a billion.

Compared to some tech tycoons, not exactly exhilarating, you might think. Although the estimate ignores the fact that the British monarch owns the largest collections of art, antiques, precious metals and diamonds in the world. Most of it bloodily looted in colonies.

In addition, it owns 19 castles and country estates on the island and holds around £7.3 billion in investments, generating around £200 million in profit per year (as of 2008). In addition, the crown currently receives 77.1 million pounds annually from the treasury—for the prestigious lifestyle and the maintenance of the royal magnificent buildings.

However, neither accounts nor leases are in the name of the heir to the throne. Of course, the latter does not personally enrich himself from the nation's wealth, he only manages the assets of the "Empire"—for the Crown. Which, according to the Windsors, should appeal to all Britons.

Accordingly, the accounting of royal finances is handled by a specially created supposedly neutral institution. For example, the British royal family is likely to be home to one of the wealthiest dynasties in the world. Even if their name never appears on rankings of the richest people in the world. The Rockefellers are also never on these lists, because they have diversified their assets accordingly and parked them in various capital collection points.

The same applies to the dynasty of the Saudi royal family, which has ruled for centuries and is said to have accumulated 1.2 trillion dollars (1,000 billion) in the meantime. But even the European royal houses are by no means impoverished, sitting on billions of dollars in assets managed across generations.

"Republics end in luxury, monarchies in poverty."
(Charles d. Second, Baron d. Montesquieu, 1689–1755)

Now, exorbitant wealth is not the core problem, but the power is, the power of those supposedly disempowered circles of the high nobility who are related and connected across state borders and generations through intra-family marriages (and therefore suffer from hemophilia in many cases).

For even if this abundance of power is hidden today behind all kinds of special laws, non-governmental organizations, foundation work and paraphrased deception, the influence of the most important dynasties seems almost unbroken even after the abolition of the absolutist monarchy almost 100 years ago.

This is evidenced by the supposedly dull life of King Charles III. In 1985, for example, the former Prince of Wales founded the organization Business in the Community, which later became the International Business Leaders Forum.

Although it officially ceased its business activities in 2013, two elitist organizations that emerged from it continue its operational tasks: the International Business Leaders Forum Global and the Partnering Initiative.

Both are dedicated to the same goal as the omnipresent World Economic Forum in Davos and complement its activities with regard to the cementing of corporatist structures at the supranational level.

The new king is just as fond of public-private partnerships—the key element of corporatism, the fascism of modernity—as are all the other reigning monarchs of our time.

In addition, since the beginning of the 1990s, Charles III has been committed to the Sustainable Development Goals that are so much in focus today. To this end, he adopted the theses on the supposedly imminent climate apocalypse prophesized in the 1972 book *Limits to Growth.* The book was published by the Club of Rome, a Switzerland-based NGO founded in 1968 with which Charles III has worked closely with.

Analogous to the long-time Club of Rome member is Beatrix Wilhelmina Armgard, better known as "Her Royal Highness Princess Beatrix of the Netherlands." Also present—how could it be otherwise with globalist activities—is the financial mogul David Rockefeller, whose discreetly acting foundations have influenced the world more than any top politician in the past 100 years, as even the renowned journal *The Lancet* admits in a publication of May 11, 2013.

> **"Some believe that we are part of a secret association that works against the best interests of the United States; they characterize my family and me as internationalists and**

claim that we have conspired with others around the world to establish a globally integrated, political-economic structure (...). If that's the charge, I'll plead guilty and I'm proud of it." (David Rockefeller, Memoirs, 2002)

The fact that Charles III is dead set on the subject of sustainability goals is demonstrated by his demand articulated in September 2020 for a "militarily organized campaign" to achieve the so-called climate protection goals.

His enthusiasm in this regard is also evidenced by the research of the United States author Joan M. Veon, who published the book *Prince Charles: The Sustainable Prince* in 1997. In the short description of the book, she outlines the complex of topics covered as follows:

"*When the US Senate ratified the Charter of the United Nations, America returned to British rule, fulfilling the goals of Cecil Rhodes, the diamond and gold magnate who left his fortune to achieve that very goal. This means that Prince Charles, as the heir to the British throne, plays a bigger role in world affairs than one might imagine. (...)*
As a result of his behind-the-scenes role at the United Nations, Prince Charles is responsible for changing the order of life from the biblical perspective of man's dominion over the earth to an order in which the earth has dominion over man. One of the great environmental philosophies that equals this is that of sustainable development."

This example exemplifies how the monarchs of Europe, seemingly removed from secular power, continue to exert massive influence on supposedly democratic structures. They finance, establish, support and represent globalist-elitist concepts, carry them out of the strategy paper stage or from partner universities into the

public debate space, where over time they become supranational recommendations for action and ultimately national laws.

Without the ostensibly philanthropic activities of Charles III, neither the capitalization of natural resources, euphemistically referred to as the "green economy," nor transatlantic corporatism would have reached its current level of development. And without the blessing of the ruler from London, no one will become prime minister in Great Britain, Canada or Australia. Yesterday's feudal lords are today's globalists.

This is illustrated by another book by Joan M. Veon from 1999, *United Nations Global Strait Jacket*, in which she examines the actual goals of the organization that acts as a de facto world government. Already in the foreword, the author deals with the burning question of how the planet can be subordinated to a unity government via increasing digitalization. She examines how Hegelian dialectics is used to evoke consensus among the population and elaborates in this regard:

"*When I first read about the New World Order, I had no idea it was a real-world government. No one ever made the connection for me. We must explain that these are one and the same. Many know or feel that something is wrong but cannot name the problem. This book will help them to make political, economic and ecological connections. It explains the Hegelian dialectic, the redefinition of government, public-private partnerships and how these instruments will soon replace the constitution, globalization, the development towards a world stock exchange and the cashless society, an international criminal court that transcends national borders, and more.*
Above all, it provides the reader with an understanding of the governance aspects of the United Nations and how its power is

shifting from the international to the local level, all with the blessing of our federal government."

Various other organizations founded by monarchs are also committed to supranational structures and centralization of political power.

See Bilderberg Conferences—a secretive series of meetings that has been held annually since 1954 and is attended by an average of 130 of the world's most powerful people. Two-thirds of the guests come from Western Europe, one-third from North America.

About two-thirds of the invited participants come from the financial sector, industry, academia or the media, and about one-third are sent by governments or political institutions. The initiator and first host of the "Bilderbergers" was Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands, who died in 2004, father of the aforementioned Beatrix and a descendant of the House of Lippe, a German noble family whose beginnings date back to the 12th century.

Bernhard was a member of the NSDAP (National Socialist Party of Germany), the Reiter-SS and the paramilitary combat group "SA" (*Sturmabteilung*). He was an ardent supporter of Adolf Hitler and corresponded with the dictator. On March 5, 2010, the British *Telegraph* reported extensively on the scandalous Nazi past of the enterprising monarch, who never admitted his Nazi connections until his death, although identity documents are available online that clearly prove his NSDAP membership.

"Somehow it seems wrong to me to say so, but the war years were the happiest of our lives."
Elizabeth Angela Marguerite Bowes-Lyon, aka Queen Mum)

In addition, Prince Bernhard was involved in the Lockheed scandal during the 1970s, profiting millions from bribery and corruption. And the so-called Project Castle also illustrates the character of the Dutch prince of German descent:

"*In 1988, Prince Bernhard and Princess Juliana sold two paintings from their private collection to raise money for the WWF.*
The paintings were sold for £ 700,000, which was deposited into a Swiss bank account belonging to the WWF.
Nevertheless, in 1989, Charles de Haes, the director-general of the WWF, transferred £500,000 back to Prince Bernhard—as de Haes explained it, for a "private project."
In 1991, newspapers reported that the money had been used to recruit mainly British mercenaries to fight poachers in nature reserves. The mercenaries infiltrated such organizations that profit from the illegal trade in ivory to dismantle them. But "Project Castle," as it was called, had turned into the opposite. Prince Bernhard's troops had not only infiltrated the illegal trade, but they also participated in it.
Irish reporter Kevin Dowling revealed that the South African army was also involved in the deal, suggesting that there were links to the white people's struggle for apartheid to continue.
(Source: Wikipedia)

Back to Great Britain: Entire books have been written about the atrocities of Charles' ancestors and the imperialism of the "Empire"—and of course you can't blame the new king of the British for the Opium Wars with China (1839–1842, 1856–1860), the concentration camps of the British in the Anglo-Boer War (1899–1902), the wanton famines in Bengal (India, 1770–1897), the East India Company or the massacre of Amritsar in April 1919, in which British troops brutally slaughtered hundreds of unarmed indigenous people.

Nevertheless, historically speaking, Charles III stands in the tradition of cruel despotism. He represents a merciless, greedy and bellicose empire whose leaders have always had a soft spot for eugenics. That said, on a human level, Charles III should be given the chance to let his actions speak for themselves before judging him as a ruler—if it weren't for a serious problem with his inner circle of friends.

In addition to the pedophile Bishop Peter Ball, this also included Jimmy Savile, the "sex monster of the BBC," probably the worst child molester and pederast ever seen on the island. More than 450 victims reported allegations against Savile to the British police. A total of 200 witnesses appeared in 14 different police districts and testified against the rapist. For weeks, the British media reported on the sinister activities of the "sex monster." All the while, Charles maintained personal correspondence with Savile, even asked the ex-TV star for advice on personal matters and was photographed on countless occasions together with the criminal, who died in 2011.

In retrospect, of course, the new king of the British claims not to have known about the pedophile tendencies of his former friend.

Notably, Charles' brother, Prince Andrew, also had similar connections. In 2010, he met in New York with child trafficker Jeffrey Epstein, who died in prison under mysterious circumstances. Prince Andrew was photographed in an intimate atmosphere with his long-time accomplice Ghislaine Maxwell, who was convicted as a human trafficker and was friends with a pedophile clergyman. I don't know about the reader, but my close circle of friends consists mostly of people with whom I share certain interests.

And I'm usually at least roughly informed about what my friends are up to. Especially when their favorite activities—as in relation

to Savile and 450 potential victims—seem to make up a large part of their private lives.

The suspicion that the two "royals" have more to do with Savile and Epstein's huge pedophile network than they admit can hardly be dismissed. Given these circumstances, Charles III has forfeited the chance to receive the benefit of the doubt.

Because believing in coincidence or ignorance seems rather naive against this background.

This applies, as it were, to the assumptions that the twelve active monarchies of Europe now have only representative functions, that the high nobility is completely disempowered, no longer has any secular influence on the democratic structures of the respective countries, and that the grotesque accumulation of capital in the hands of the aristocracy after the abolition of absolutism almost a century ago does not pose a problem.

On closer inspection, the suspicion must arise that the dynasties of the high nobility, which have ruled for over a millennium, never really abandoned their self-image of superior rulers and that they are instead simply pulling the strings from the background, in a postmodernity where the worship of godlike individual rulers became unpopular at the beginning of the twentieth century.

Not to mention the arrogant habitus of some top politicians, CEOs or philanthropists who behave like kings. It is not for nothing that the technocratic corporatism of our time is best described by the term neo-feudalism.

"Nothing is just in a monarchy." (Asfa-Wossen Asserate, Stern No. 14/2007, March 29, 2007, p. 250)

September 25, 2022

Harbingers of Dystopia

Pipelines are being sabotaged in the Baltic Sea, Moscow declares the contested regions of Ukraine to be Russian territory, Kiev signs an official application for NATO membership. This raises the question: are these events only intensifying the ongoing geo-economic conflicts or is the continuous spiral of escalation the eve of a third world war?

The questions raised in the following, the necessary criticism and justified doubts, are neither an expression of latent anti-Americanism nor of sympathy for a specific political spectrum—but simply an expression of anti-imperialism. After all, empires basically only serve the feudal-criminally organized castes that control them. The aim is to challenge the narratives of a faceless, supranational bureaucracy that supposedly intends to maneuver humanity into a third world war.

And it is a sad fact that war is not a disaster for all people on this planet—something that anyone who can feel empathy is convinced of. Au contraire. For the profiteers of the hegemonic risk game, namely banks, asset managers, corporate cartels, top politicians, Big Tech, NGOs, the military-industrial complex, et cetera, an escalating, an all-out war in continental Europe would be tantamount to a "historic opportunity" or "once-in-a-lifetime opportunity."

Analogous to the Covid crisis. This is evidenced by recent statements by US Secretary of State Antony Blinken, who perceives the EU's energy situation as an "enormous opportunity."

In this context, it should not be forgotten that the United States participated primarily in the Second World War because the treasury was empty, a new monetary system was to be introduced, and geopolitical reorganization was to be pursued. The Russian armed forces had already almost single-handedly wiped-out Nazi Germany. And until the official entry of the United States into the war on December 8, 1941, the day after Pearl Harbor, Wall Street high finance subsidized the Nazi regime of Adolf Hitler without any hesitation.

It is in this light that the events of the past few days must be analyzed. Questioning. Not with the one-dimensional tunnel vision of the Western NATO narrative or from Vladimir Putin's strategic perspective. Because there is war—and with it propaganda. Neither side reports neutrally and "says what is," as *SPIEGEL* founder Rudolf Augstein once linguistically compressed the central task of journalism.

Only by triangulating all available sources can a halfway realistic assessment of the situation be achieved. And as is so often the case, this deviates significantly from what the leading Western media praise as neutral reporting. This is because the leading news outlets of the NATO countries consistently suppress crucial information that would allow the population to form its own picture of the situation.

This applies, first of all, to Russia's partial mobilization, which Putin announced on September 21, 2022. Instead of the full speech, which can be found with English dubbing on RT (Russia Today) and lasts almost 15 minutes, only short set pieces of the eloquent speech were broadcast on the territory of the North Atlantic military alliance. Tendentious editing to make the supposed nemesis sound as threatening as possible.

This applies, first of all, to Russia's partial mobilization, which Putin announced on September 21, 2022.

Instead of the full speech, which can be found with English dubbing on RT (Russia Today) and lasts almost 15 minutes, only short set pieces of the eloquent speech were broadcast on the territory of the North Atlantic military alliance.

Tendentious editing to make the supposed nemesis sound as threatening as possible. As a result, viewers in the EU missed the relevant passages. The 447 million inhabitants of the European Union are also only able to do their own research to a limited extent. This is because major "enemy channels," such as RT and Sputnik, are subject to blanket censorship in the 27 EU member states. In addition, almost all search engines and digital platforms curate their content on the topic of the Ukraine crisis according to the common consensus of the West. Even those that until recently stood for freedom of expression. Heterodox information about the war hardly reaches anyone in the West who is not actively looking for it.

A few days after the aforementioned announcement of a Russian partial mobilization, on September 26, 2022, explosions shook the seabed off the coast of Denmark and Sweden. The controversial gas pipelines Nord Stream 1 and Nord Stream 2 suffered a massive drop in pressure.

Bomb attacks are cited by Sweden and Denmark as the likely cause. On September 27, 2022, EU chief Ursula von der Leyen also made up her mind and spoke of sabotage. She has not yet explicitly named a suspect. The first photos taken by Danish emergency services show how the sea surface is bubbling over the three leaks that have occurred.

Seismologists believe that at least 100 kilograms of TNT were detonated for the blasts. Other estimates speak of up to 500 kilograms. And according to scientists in the *Guardian*, the methane that has leaked so far is equivalent to the emission values of 1.3 million vehicles.

German estimates even put the amount of methane released at 300,000 tonnes. This would be equivalent to the emissions of 5.8 million vehicles over a period of 20 years. This is green foreign policy in 2022.

What the Western media do not (anymore) mention in connection with the blasts is that the Baltic Sea is one of the best-guarded and busiest waters in the world. Corresponding real-time maps illustrate the maritime activities.

Several US warships were in the area at the time of the attacks. At times, without sending location signals, as is usually the case, to avoid collisions. In addition, weeks before the momentous event, the CIA had already issued explicit warnings to the German government, announcing that attacks on the pipelines might be planned. But these were apparently studiously ignored.

As recently as the beginning of September 2022, *Focus Online* reported on the activities of the United States Navy and its allies in the Baltic Sea.

According to NATO, these began no later than January 2022, when naval units were transferred to the region.

In April, the Western alliance also reported further troop deployments to the Baltic Sea. A month before the pipelines were blown up, mainstream portals such as Sky News reported on how the

Americans and British were training Ukrainian naval forces in the region in the use of underwater drones.

And on September 22, a few days before the explosions, German newspapers reported that a large US Navy naval unit was passing through the Fehmarn Belt, where various Russian nuclear submarines were cruising at the same time.

Explosive: On September 28, 2022, it became known that US helicopters were located exactly above the affected locations shortly after the detonations.

In addition, shortly after the explosion, an unidentified aircraft coming from North America entered Polish airspace, where it was supplied with kerosene by a US tanker plane, then circled over the NS2 leak for 40 minutes and then landed on a ship without a transponder in the middle of the sea. A US aircraft carrier, one must conclude. A corresponding map from Flightradar24 shows the ominous air traffic.

Unfortunately, this background information is not addressed in the leading NATO media when it comes to the geopolitical or military-strategic classification of current events.

What defenders of the bellicose confrontation course now also like to sweep under the carpet is the clear announcement by US President Joe Biden, who announced at a press conference in February 2022, three weeks before the start of the Russian invasion of Donbas, that the United States would put an end to the Nord Stream project under any circumstances. When asked by a reporter how this was to be achieved, since the responsibility for these pipelines lay with Germany, Biden replied simply: "*I promise you, we will be able to do it.*"

Victoria *"Fuck the EU"* Nuland, who rose to dubious fame as a former undersecretary of state in the United States State Department and a key figure in the Washington-orchestrated regime change in Kiev in 2014, also expressed herself accordingly.

This circumstance recently even prompted exposed US mainstream moderators such as Tucker Carlson (FOX News) to express the suspicion that the Biden administration itself was responsible for the attack on European infrastructure.

The motives seem conclusive, since close economic ties between Germany and Russia have always been a thorn in the side of the United States.

Dubious in this context: Radek Sikorski, Member of the European Parliament and former Foreign and Defense Minister of Poland, thanked the United States via Twitter on September 27, 2022, for blowing up the Nord Stream pipelines. Two days later, however, he deleted his post on the platform, which makes the matter seem even more suspicious, as US journalist Dan Cohen aptly comments in the linked tweet.

The biography of Radek Sikorski is also interesting. At the beginning of the millennium, he was a member of the neoconservative US think tank AEI (American Enterprise Institute). In 2008, Sikorski, as a diplomat, signed a contract for Poland to install a US missile shield as part of the National Missile Defense.

Sikorski currently serves as a member of the Steering Committee of the Bilderberg Conferences as well as a Senior Fellow at Harvard University. In addition, in 2014 the MEP was asked by the British to lead a diplomatic mission in Ukraine in order to persuade the

parties to the Euromaidan conflict to reach a peaceful agreement—which apparently turned into the opposite.

After the explosions of NS1 and NS2, the events came thick and fast. A Moscow-initiated referendum in the four contested regions of Donbas—Donetsk, Luhansk, Kherson and Zaporizhzhia—held from September 23 to September 27 has come to a clear conclusion that the majority of people living there are in favor of annexation to Russia.

However, the Western community of values immediately branded this vote as illegitimate, even though independent election observers were also on site and the population was not forced to vote by force, as postulated in the West.

Although the elections did not always meet the usual standards, which the organizers justified, when asked, by pointing to the special circumstances under which the vote had to take place. Conversations with the residents and the pictures of celebrating crowds certainly gave the impression that it was a legitimate vote.

This simply means that the sovereign is allowed to vote freely. This is not always secret, even in grassroots democratic models such as the Swiss "Landsgemeinde," where public voting is still carried out with a show of hands. So, we would have to recognize the will of the people in Donbas if we were to take up the cause of democracy. Because it stands for the will of the people.

As a consequence of the pro-Russian vote, Vladimir Putin declared the four regions in question Russian territory on Sunday, September 30, 2022.

Just two days later, on October 1, 2022, Ukraine signed an application for NATO membership, insisting on an accelerated procedure along the lines of Finland.

This, after the head of the Ukrainian military demanded long-range missiles from Washington at the beginning of September and *did not rule out a "limited nuclear war"* with the huge neighboring country.

Although initial voices from NATO and the EU attest to the poor prospects of success of the membership application, it is certainly a further provocation to Moscow.

If this membership application is accepted—and according to reports by the *Tagesschau* on October 2, 2022, a total of nine NATO countries support Kyiv's request—any reaction by Russia to Ukraine's attacks in the annexed territories could lead to the declaration of a NATO alliance case. And thus de facto to the Third World War.

A statement by the North Atlantic Defense Alliance, as the Brussels-based warmongering organization euphemistically calls itself, attests to the West's aggressive stance on September 29, 2022.

Notwithstanding the fact that any circumstantial trial, after examining the above facts, would conclude that the culprit for the attacks would be sought in the ranks of the United States allies or directly in Washington, Western media are trying to outdo each other in trying to blame Russia for the incident. Whether *Der Standard, CNBC, Business Insider, Washington Post, CNN* or *BILD*—they all construct the wildest theories to make Russia the sole scapegoat with baseless propaganda elaborates instead of devoting themselves to the elephant in the room.

While even 9/11 gatekeeper Noam Chomsky, who described the Ukraine conflict as a proxy war of the United States against Russia as early as June 2022, articulated in recent days that actually only America could be responsible for the Nord Stream sabotage. Renowned US military analyst Scott Ritter assesses the situation on September 30 in a similar way.

At the same time as the attacks on the Nord Stream project, a new Baltic pipeline was opened in the presence of Polish President Andrzej Duda and Polish Prime Minister Mateusz Morawiecki, which has been able to pump Norwegian gas to Poland via Denmark and the Baltic Sea since October 1, 2022. In addition to Poland, the pipeline will also supply gas to the Baltic states and Slovakia. Morawiecki described the project as a "pipeline of freedom, sovereignty, security and peace."

Ergo, the standard question of criminology—Cui bono?—The answer is relatively simple.

After all, it can hardly be in Russia's interest to blow up its own pipeline if Moscow could simply turn off the tap to stop gas supplies.

Why blow-up infrastructure in which billions have been invested, only to announce a few days later that the pipelines will be repaired in a timely manner? Nor does Russia show any ambition to invade Europe and invade Germany, even if the German press likes to paint such Russophobic horror scenarios on the wall.

From the outset, Putin declared that his goal was limited to the liberation of the ethnic Russian population in the Donbas, which has been bullied, oppressed and bombed by a corrupt and totalitarian regime in Kiev for years. And his actions so far give no reason to insinuate otherwise.

In addition, the United States in particular is benefiting from the cutting of Russian gas supplies to Europe, as European imports of dirty fracked gas from America increase as a result. And Europe is dependent on energy imports. Like a junkie. Now the neo-feudal confederation of states simply has another dealer's needle in its arm. In addition, the EU's final break with Russia consolidates the position of American geoeconomics and, in the long term, prevents an alliance between the two most economically attractive countries in continental Europe. In the event of constructive collaboration, an alliance between these two powers could mean the end of the imperialist plans of the Anglo-American East Coast elites.

The fact that only Russia wants to convene a special session of the UN Security Council at short notice to clarify the acts of sabotage seems significant, but various member states of the organization apparently put obstacles in the way of such an investigation and clarification.

France, for its part, described the Ukraine war as a real *game-changer* for the UN Security Council.

In the course of an escalating conflict, the supranational body could expand its sphere of influence, claim new powers and admit other countries as permanent members.

Thus, every crisis, every conflict and every war represent a positive development for one entity in particular: the United Nations. An event directed by big business for the conformity of human civilization. Distraction through maritime manipulation and media clamor about the blasts in the Baltic Sea thus primarily help predatory casino capitalism, which was once again on the verge of its final implosion on September 28, 2022.

In Great Britain, the Bank of England was able to intervene just in time with support purchases to prevent a mass insolvency of local pension funds—possibly the last straw that would have been the straw that broke the camel's back and plunged the world financial system into collapse. Here, too, any further disruption could be the first domino in a long chain of pending disasters.

It remains unclear whether the situation in Ukraine will turn into a conflagration and turn Europe into a battlefield. In any case, the continuously turning spiral of escalation is alarming. Especially considering the fact that for decades American military strategists have been developing tactical scenarios for another world war in order to assert their dominance over Russia and China.

As early as 2017, an article in the *INDEPENDENT* stated that the third world war was practically set. On June 6, 2016, an article by *The National Interest* explains in detail how NATO plans to win a third world war in Europe. Whichever way you look at it, if the military conflicts between NATO, Russia and China culminate in a global war, Europe in particular will go up in flames.

So, it can't hurt to prepare mentally and logistically for this scenario, which is becoming more and more likely.

Now it is possible, as it were, that the armed conflicts in Ukraine will not escalate further and that localized fighting will remain.

But even in this case, humanity is likely to face enough chaos and suffering in the coming years. It is not for nothing that the head of the WFP (World Food Program), David Beasley, warned of looming famines of unprecedented proportions as early as July of this year.

After all, the chain reactions triggered by an educational precariat corrupted by globalist vested interests can hardly be contained. Whether it's the financial or health care system, energy or food supply—humanity will probably have to deal with very existential problems in the coming years. With bare survival.

Therefore, one cannot appeal to reason often enough at the moment, and emphasize love, human rights, humanism, pacifism and a sense of community. After all, it is these fundamental emotions, insights, values and principles that turn people into social beings—and individuals into a community.

This should be organized in a timely and decentralized manner—independent of political milieus and ideological preferences—in order to be able to counter the transformative momentum of a totalitarian, biofascist seizure of power. Because it could be the last rebellion of the Enlightenment. The inhumane, stereotypical monoculture of postmodernism, which is increasingly cemented in the "new normal," pursues diametrically opposed goals and drives the basically peace-loving human family into a technocratic-totalitarian utopia of the ruling caste, which for the rest of civilization calls itself dystopia.

October 2, 2022

Reappraisal – Now!

At some point in the future, people will look back on the 2020s and wonder how it all started. They will want to know at what point in postmodernism civilization said goodbye to the values of the Enlightenment, humanism, universal human rights and the "*sovereign autonomy of the individual*" (Nietzsche, *Genealogy of Morality*, 1887).

Our descendants will want to understand where the turning point was, until what moment the developments could have been stopped. Just as we have learned in the meantime to understand why fascism succeeded under Hitler. That is why a phase of reappraisal, documentation and reflection is needed. Society must take a self-critical look at the events of the past two and a half years, which are unique in a negative sense, in order to learn lessons from them.

Especially now that most countries have declared the health emergency over—at least temporarily. But those responsible in politics, business and the media in particular avoid this reappraisal like the devil avoids holy water. They hope that their sometimes-unforgivable transgressions will fall victim to tunnel vision towards Russia or the hectic pulsating attention economy and fall into oblivion.

"History is a philosophy that teaches us by example."
Henry St. John (1678–1751), a political author of the Enlightenment.

It is precisely for this reason that the book *»Möge die gesamte Republik mit dem Finger auf sie zeigen.«: Das Corona-Unrecht und seine Täter* (May the entire republic point the finger at them—The Covid injustice and its perpetrators) to be published by Rubikon-Verlag on November 7, 2022, is such an important contemporary historical document.

For it provides the caesura described at the beginning, the beginning of the "new normal," with a time stamp. It documents for posterity how, when and where language (again) degenerated into a vehicle for an imposed shift of moral limits—a steppingstone for a flimsy plausibility and segregative bio totalitarianism.

On the basis of 100 telling quotes from alleged representatives of the people, journalists, physicians and other personalities in the public eye, Markus Klöckner, Jens Wernicke and Ulrike Guérot, who contributes the foreword, illustrate that tyranny does not only manifest itself when execution squads roam the streets or neighboring countries are attacked at dawn.

They show how communication became a weapon in the wake of the presumed pandemic of the century, information became a lever for "social engineering," the political spectrum became a divisive fungus and the consolidated media landscape became a propaganda tool.

Historically, totalitarian systems have always implemented themselves through the creeping equalization, reinterpretation and reinterpretation of the meaning of the word. They literally rape language—war is peace, ignorance is strength, freedom is slavery. George Orwell sends his regards.

Thus, the centrally directed Covid infection regime, which was just as high-handedly willing to snub federal processes as it was ethical customs, displayed an aggressively connoted style from the outset.

Official crisis communication demonstratively drove wedges into the socio-economic structures of a country unsettled by panic trumpets, lobbyists and self-proclaimed experts. However, the toxic discourse reached its peak with the start of the vaccination campaign.

While masks, lockdowns and curfews were initially the focus of the debate, later it was mRNA injections, access regulations, QR codes, vaccination obligations and ID cards. The verbal gaffes of an interpretive elite corrupted by pharmaceutical, financial and digital cartels culminated in the open discrimination of people who were unwilling to subordinate their non-negotiable right to bodily self-determination to collectivist hysteria.

The unvaccinated—they were the new fringe group. They were to blame. The lepers. Disloyal heretics. The new artificial enemy against whom every successful tyrant needs to rally the rest of the population—the obedient, fearful, gullible and obedient to authority. The de facto reporting on the health crisis proclaimed in March 2020 left no doubt from the outset that a drastic change was underway. That a paradigm shift is imminent.

Nuanced debates, balanced, fact-based argumentation and grey area were yesterday—from “day zero” onwards, only black and white existed. Right and wrong. Good and evil.

The fact that the Covid crisis in this light marks the beginning of an extremely dark era is made unmistakably clear by the semantic monstrosities compiled by Klöckner et al.

The authors provide what the official evaluation of the Covid measures by a commission of experts appointed by Berlin did not achieve—a painful detailed analysis of the inhumane manners that left deep, hard-to-heal scars in society's connective tissue. Each trench warfare caused a new fissure.

The cracks no longer ran only through political milieus and ideological echo chambers, as would be common practice in a colorful, contentious party landscape, but through the middle of company employees, families and circles of friends.

It was not lockdowns, masks, mRNA pusher columns or QR codes that drove people apart, but framing phrases, semantics and the presentation of the corresponding topics by opinion-forming institutions, prominent people and paid influencers. The interpretive elite, fueled by cancel culture and "Woko Haram," wrote, shouted and scolded themselves into a veritable frenzy.

The newly gained power to be able to insult others with virtually no consequences was truly savored, as some of the now preserved quotes suggest:

> **"What is needed now is not more openness, but a sharp wedge. Someone who divides society. (...)**
> **Properly and deeply struck, it separates the dangerous from the endangered part of society."**
> **(Christian Vooren, ZEIT Online)**

But even dangerous desk offenders, followers, cowards and opportunists will eventually have to answer for hatred and agitation. This applies equally to Olaf Scholz, Karl Lauterbach, Jens Spahn, Wolfgang Niedecken or Nikolaus Blome, whose fascistic quote adorns the cover.

Because they all demonstrate a striking oblivion of history. And they seem to have forgotten that all empires are falling. That may take some time at times. But paper is patient. "*Remembering means choosing*," said Günter Grass.

Thus, the compendium of horror which Rubikon-Verlag will publish as a paperback and e-book on November 7, 2022 represents a time capsule against forgetting. A time capsule that resists the beginnings by capturing them immutably.

With their new book, the authors do exactly what makes a true democrat: they live participation, demand constructive discourse and joint reappraisal. Moreover, in a dysfunctional media landscape, they fulfill exactly the task that gave the Fourth Estate its name:

Journalistic documentation of "*what is*."

Without chroniclers of the present, any historical contextualization of current events is unthinkable. Only by looking into the past does an unadulterated recorded present time make sense. For this reason, those who uncritically supported the course of the federal government during the temporary-permanent health crisis should take the book by Marcus Klöckner and co to heart. Because if, in view of the linguistic encroachments and dam bursts gathered here, these people still hold the position that such communication characterizes a liberally organized democracy, then at least you know who you are dealing with—fascists.

After reading this book at the latest, one can no longer avoid calling a spade a spade. Because fascism is not left or right—but inhumane. Inhuman. The red lines, after the crossing of which

one could still have spoken of reckless derailment or ignorance, are miles behind us.

Intent, concerted action and the wanton maltreatment of traditional civilizational achievements are now beyond question. This proves once again “May the entire republic point the finger at them.” And since it is to be feared that the increasingly aggressive censorship of the platform economy will increasingly help collective forgetting in the future—in other words evidence will disappear from the digital space—the book is fortunately in printed form.

“Because what you have in black and white, you can confidently carry home.” (Johann Wolfgang v. Goethe)

October 5, 2022

The Grotesque Protests

The self-proclaimed last generation is trying to save its habitat with radical climate protests. In doing so, the activists are playing into the hands of the very environmental sinners they are fighting. In this way, they may actually make themselves the last free-living representatives of the species *Homo sapiens.*

While the Covid crisis, which has become the "pandemic of the vaccinated," is constantly losing its potential for intimidation, and while the one-dimensional and outrageous portrayal of the Ukraine conflict is likewise visibly losing credibility—in other words two of the most important levers for manipulating the public are slipping away from the ruling caste—the postulated climate apocalypse is increasingly coming back into focus.

Flanked by a home-made energy crisis, every political decision by European governments is subordinated to the goal of sustainability. By tightening the belt, one also harms the arch-enemy Russia, so the erroneous assumption. Organizations such as Fridays for Future, The Last Generation or Extinction Rebellion are trying with all their might, and with massive support from the leading media, to draw the attention of the masses to themselves and their deluded actionism.

To this end, the mostly young activists paralyze the capital's traffic at regular intervals with sit-ins. The following day, after they were released from police custody, they complained on the

various social media platforms about the rough night in the cell and the threat of repression.

They glue their hands to the asphalt, to works of art by old masters or trigger false fire alarms in the Bundestag. Younger generations around the world are fighting to preserve their habitat.

Basically, a laudable development. Because it would actually be high time to get to grips with rampant environmental pollution, species extinction, overfishing of the oceans or deforestation of the rainforests.

Unfortunately, however, this will never be the result of the naïve commitment of the aforementioned organizations—because the so-called sustainability goals, "green economy" and carbon footprint are not about protecting Mother Nature, but about the development of new markets and their centralized control. Capitalization and consolidation of natural resources. It is the last "asset" that international high finance has not yet been able to fully privatize.

For this reason, it is mainly those profit-greedy energy giants that have so far polluted the environment particularly unscrupulously—namely such illustrious corporations as Exxon Mobile, Royal Dutch Shell or Chevron—who are now at the forefront of financing the supposed energy transition.

Contrary to all the fine-sounding marketing phrases, they are not doing this in order to reduce their CO_2 emissions and actually produce more sustainably. They are doing it to expand trading in carbon certificates and thus create the largest investment market in the world.

Value: about four trillion US dollars. In this market, the unscrupulously mafia-like energy companies will be able to buy their way out of the obligation to ever have to change anything in their dirty business practices thanks to CO_2 indulgences.

Top politicians and NGOs support this kamikaze capitalism out of the simple self-interest of being able to control the population at the micro level via the "carbon footprint" and insinuated energy shortages. Goodbye individual mobility. Climate lockdowns and dark winters ahead.

Thus, left-green organizations such as The Last Generation are ultimately financed, corrupted and instrumentalized precisely by the predatory capitalists whose environmental pollution and overexploitation they denounce. An example of this is the most prominent face of the radicalized climate apocalypticists: Greta Thunberg (19). Because the media omnipresence of the Swedish climate activist and millionaire is no coincidence.

The daughter of the well-known left-liberal opera singer and activist Marlena Ernman, who suffers from Asperger's syndrome, was deliberately groomed as a figure of identification, as a detailed dossier by investigative journalist Cory Morningstar from January 23, 2019 suggests. Thunberg is surrounded by people who know how to profit from her exposed role. In addition to her well-connected mother, the young Swede was assisted by the media-experienced Reemtsma offspring Luisa-Marie Neubauer in particular to achieve her media breakthrough. Some even refer to her as Greta's Coach.

Climate protection now seems to be the family core business of the wealthy tobacco manufacturers, who achieved dubious fame in the 1930s as ardent NSDAP supporters and major donors to Hitler's

leadership. Luisa's mother was already active in the anti-nuclear movement of the 1980s. Her sister, Carla Reemtsma, is a leading member of Fridays for Future. Luisa Neubauer has also been working since 2016 in the ONE Campaign, a non-governmental organization initially funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, which says it is committed to fighting poverty in Africa.

Other donors to the ONE Campaign include old acquaintances such as the Rockefeller Foundation, the Ford Foundation, Bloomberg, Bank of America, the Apple Group and George Soros' Open Society Foundation. Names that, historically speaking, do not necessarily stand for nature conservation and charity.

Neubauer, Thunberg and co. are making themselves—knowingly or unknowingly—cheap vicarious agents of elitist transformation processes. They fight for the goals of internationally networked oligarchs who shroud their organized criminal activities in the guise of flimsy philanthropy, shouting slogans of advertising agencies whose clients hide behind a façade of pseudo-ecological charities to implement their social credit systems glorified with euphemisms.

Because that's what it amounts to when digital bank accounts, health status and individual CO_2 tracking on the smartphone are linked and fully automatic monitoring of these parameters becomes commonplace. Thus, the climate activists of our time all degenerate into tragic-comic henchmen of an Anglo-American financial elite that had already recognized in the 1920s that the key to absolute control over the entire world population was the automated management of global energy consumption.

It is precisely this approach that now constitutes the core argument of all considerations for the prevention of supposedly dramatic

climate change. A dystopia that captivates. This is evidenced by the presence of Neubauer and her associates in the German media landscape as well as on high-reach online channels.

The successful crowdfunding campaigns of Fridays for Future, which quickly raise six-figure sums, also show that the scare-mongering is working and finding its audience.

The idea of an energy-driven, technocratic-totalitarian society was provided by the Technocracy movement, founded in New York in 1917. The concept was well received. Especially with globalists and old capital. Even if, of course, there was a lack of technical possibilities to implement the noble goals at the time. A century later, however, this aspect is no longer an obstacle. Thanks to total digitization.

The consequences of the implementation of such a model of rule can be seen today in China, the pilot project for modern tyranny launched and supervised by Rockefeller, Henry Kissinger, George Bush, Zbigniew Brzezinski and Yale University.

What the globalist circles and high finance grandees lacked in the 1970s to finally be able to give free rein to their feudalistic control mania were, in addition to technological progress, valid arguments for a corresponding transformation movement. A story that could be sold to the masses as a charitable act, as a necessity, as there was no alternative.

The Club of Rome, founded by Rockefeller and Co. and based in Winterthur, Switzerland, provided this with its publication *The Limits to Growth,* published in 1972. Since the publication of the pamphlet, climate change, which is causally fueled by the carbon emissions of human civilization, has been considered

an existential threat to *Homo sapiens*. It has been a singularly acceptable narrative in leading media and state-funded research institutions. Search engines such as Google only spit out results that support this uniform opinion of scientific interpretive elites. Scientific methodology, interdisciplinary discourse, thesis and antithesis, pluralism of opinion? Far from it.

Even if the "Last Judgement" of meteorology has now had to be dated back several times, because neither the polar ice caps completely melted away nor the coastal areas were willing to sink into the sea on time.

And crude oil is still being produced, contrary to all the pessimistic predictions of the past five decades. The covers of the quality media from the past 50 years are a litany of false forecasts. The *New York Post* published a corresponding editorial on November 12, 2021, impressively documenting the failure of the prophets of doom, who sounded the alarm as early as 1972 because humanity had only ten years to apply the catastrophe even then.

But even half a century after this first urgent warning from the United Nations (UN), the apocalypse may not really be happening. Even though the weather maps on public radio now give the impression that the earth is on fire, even in normal summer heat, none of those ultimate horror scenarios that were to haunt us for decades has yet occurred.

In fact, global warming is decreasing. This is because the percentage annual temperature increase is declining. From 1998 to 2012, there was no increase in global warming at all, as even the climate researchers of the United States government institution NOAA (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration) had to admit in a report dated September 1, 2018.

Since the day of the publication of *The Limits to Growth*, there has been massive criticism of the elite think tank's findings, conclusions and gloomy forecasts. Scientists are widely divided, arguing about whether man-made climate change exists at all, whether the planet is getting warmer in the long term, and whether there is a causal relationship between the accumulation of carbon dioxide in the Earth's atmosphere and a temporary falsifiable increase in temperature.

There have been phases in the planet's recent history when the CO_2 concentration in the atmosphere was higher, but the average temperature was lower.

In other phases of Earth's history, the CO_2 concentration was significantly lower but the temperatures were higher, as a detailed analysis by *Real Climate Science* explains.

Thus, in 1132, the entire Rhine dried up. From the year 1303 there is a report of how it was possible to cross the Rhine, Danube and Elbe with dry feet. In 1536, Europe was hit by another massive drought. Crop failures and a millennium wine were the result. From October 1539 to April 1540, not a single drop of rain fell, Lake Constance, which was almost 250 meters deep, dried up, and the island of Lindau was connected to the mainland.

The same was true in 1715, when natural irrigation failed to materialize from March to October—all without any industrial revolution. Even Harald Lesch, the scientific explanatory uncle of Germany's mainstream TV news outlets, spoke until a few years ago that the planet was in a "*relatively warm cold period*," at the end of a small ice age. At that time, he obviously did not see global warming as a significant threat. In the meantime, he announces the exact opposite.

These backgrounds seem to be diametrically opposed to the monocausal logic of the climate apocalypticists and to invalidate the postulated causal relationship between CO_2 emissions and the greenhouse effect. This is probably also the view of the 9,029 postdoctoral scientists who have supported and signed the Global Warming Petition Project, which has been circulating since 1998—along with 20,000 other US scientists without doctorates who are signing. According to the joint statement, they all see no convincing evidence for the supposed causal link between CO_2 emissions and global warming.

As early as 2012, a group of 125 researchers sent an open letter to the then UN Secretary-General to point out that there is no climate emergency. In 2019, there were as many as 500 scientists who sent the same message to the United Nations. Unfortunately, without success, as can be easily seen from the unanimous interpretations of the situation these days.

Why are the voices of renowned specialists ignored? Why do Google and co. censor everything and everyone who dares to question the official narrative? The discourse contamination on the topic of climate change in the public sphere is reminiscent of 9/11, the Covid crisis or the Ukraine conflict, for each of which there was only one possible interpretation that was considered to be within the acceptable range of the dominant opinion collective. And there are reasons for that.

As was already made known in 2009 under the heading Climategate, a manageable number of scientists control the debate space on the topic. They decide which studies survive the usurped peer review process and are to be presented to the general public as serious science. To date.

Although more than a thousand emails published by hackers from the circles in question made it clear 13 years ago that the apocalyptic climate forecasts are not only wrong but deliberately manipulated.

Even the fact that the Climategate scandal was picked up in November 2009 by mainstream gazettes such as the *Guardian*, the *Telegraph*, the *BBC* or high-reach media outlets such as RT did not prevent the attention economy from quickly forgetting it. Only a few dealt with the allegations of manipulation in detail and without reservations. The quality media were not one of them.

The exception was a 91-page paper from 2006, the Wegman Report, which forensically examines the work of climate researchers and, for example, refutes the calculation bases for the "hockey stick curve," which is now taught in textbooks and holds out the prospect of an exponential increase in the Earth's climate.

The statisticians led by Edward Wegman examined the temperature curves of the past 1,000 years reconstructed by the Climatic Research Unit (CRU), on which the calculation models of the hockey stick advocates are based. And with it all the climate change narratives of our time.

They came to the clear conclusion that the working methods of the CRU scientists can at least be described as obscure and that criticism of their climate models is absolutely justified. In addition, Wegman and colleagues demanded in their paper that the leading CRU climate scientists and their peer review network disclose the amount and origin of their funding, as well as any other information that could lead to a conflict of interest in establishing the truth in their discipline.

Although the Wegman Report severely shook the narrative of the climate apocalypse and had the potential to bring it down completely, in the end the usual happened: nothing.

The voices of the climate rationalists faded away in the vastness of the scrubbed internet. The manipulated narrative of man-made global warming persisted. Despite all the facts. The style—as well as the motives of the authors—of the mail dump on WikiLeaks of the British University of East Anglia's CRU are more than clear. This is evidenced by a few examples compiled by journalist Andrew Bolt for the Australian newspaper *The Herald Sun*.

The messages were all sent between 1996 and 2009. Particularly telling are the e-mails from Philip D. Jones, a British climate researcher by trade, who tells his colleague Michael E. Mann and others how he manipulated his data to represent the desired temperature increase:

"*I've just completed Mike's Nature trick and included the real temperatures in the series of the last 20 years (in other words, from 1981) and from 1961 for Keith to hide the decline.*"

Mick Kelly, professor of climate change at Jones University, writes about the concealment of the recent cooling:

"*Anyway, I may cut off the last few points from the filtered curve before I give the talk again, as it is trending downward due to the end effects and the last cold years.*"

In a message to the CRU, climate change entrepreneur Adam Markham calls for more effective propaganda on the subject:

"*Australians are concerned that this could be a slightly more conservative approach to risk than they hear from CSIRO (Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization). In particular, they would like to see the section on fluctuations and extreme events spiced up if possible.*"

Other emails from Philip D. Jones that speak a clear language are as follows:

"*I wish that climate change would take place so that science would be right. Regardless of the consequences. That's not political, that's selfish.*"

"*I hope you're not right about the absence of warming until about 2020. I would have rather hoped to see a press release from the Met Office with Doug's paper saying something like: Half the years to 2014 would surpass the warmest year of the moment. Record, 1998!*"

"*If they ever hear that there is now a Freedom of Information Act in the UK, I will probably delete the file instead of sending it to anyone. We also have a data protection law behind which I will hide.*"

"*To Ammann/Wahl: Try to change the date of receipt! Don't give these skeptics anything to amuse themselves with.*"

"*I can't see any of these papers in the next IPCC report. K. and I will somehow keep them out—even if we have to redefine what peer-reviewed literature is!*"

"*How this will be dealt with is unclear, as there are a number of people with good scientific qualifications who could be used by an unscrupulous editor to ensure that anti-greenhouse science survives the peer review process (Legates, Balling, Lindzen, Baliunas, Bald, etc.).*"

The IPCC's lead author, Kevin Trenberth, blames his colleagues Mann, Santer, Wigley and Jones, as well as other leading alarmists such as Stephen H. Schneider and James Hansen, that the data unfortunately does not support what the manipulated climate models predict:

"(...) *Where the hell is global warming? We're asking this here in Boulder, where we've been breaking records for the coldest days since records began in the last two days.* (...) *The fact is that we cannot explain the lack of warming at the moment. And it's a farce that we can't do that.*"

A real farce is hidden in the source code of the actual CRU forecasting software, which calculates at regular intervals that the climate inferno is imminent. In the lines of the modeling code, the programmers have left comments and notes that are intended to remind them of how the respective calculation routine works, but which also clearly show what the formulas, modeling and arithmetic operations of the CRU are all about.

The following is a short excerpt from the program code:

- *Plots **24 yearly maps of calibrated** (PCR-infilled or not) MXD reconstructions*
- *of growing season temperatures. Uses "**corrected**" MXD— but shouldn't usually*
- *plot past 1960 because these will be **artificially adjusted** to look closer to*
- *the real temperatures.*
- ***Plots (1 at a time) yearly maps of calibrated** (PCR-infilled or not) MXD*
- *reconstructions*

– *of growing season temperatures. Uses **"corrected"** MXD—but shouldn't usually*
– *plot past 1960 because these will be **artificially adjusted** to look closer to*
– *the real temperatures.*

In summary, the paragraph of the original English code shown here shows one thing: the scientists do not work with real data. They intervene manually to be able to display temperature profiles, in this example after 1960, more dramatically. This science is therefore not based on evidence, the real processes in nature or trustworthy data—it strives to produce and plausibly check the results that its financiers in high finance, nobility, corporations, NGOs and politics expect.

So the media campaign to limit the damage was not long in coming after the publication of the telling correspondence. Government science and the leading media primarily focused on hackers as condemnable evildoers. Not the unscrupulous untruth-spreading scientists of the CRU or their associated peer-review gatekeepers. And there was also no outcry from the population, which had apparently been brazenly lied to for decades.

The conviction that *Homo sapiens* represents a plague for the planet seems to have already gone too far. Not surprisingly, after five decades of brainwashing and media consonance on the subject of climate, environmental and species protection.

Disregarding the fact that the climate science elite has been exposed by the WikiLeaks Climategate data, the sustainability goals of the United Nations' Agenda 2030 continue to be based on the modulations and forecasts of that data. And thus, on clumsy fraud. The data on which the socio-economic transformation of

the era is based is constantly adapted and decontextualized by an infiltrated academic establishment in order to be able to justify controversial and disruptive paradigm shifts as well as anti-democratic, supranational forms of organization. Counter-theses and critical analyses are consistently sorted out by a network of purchased science authors in the peer review process. The climate blasphemists who write it are discredited.

So it is hardly surprising that the first permanent EU Council President, Herman van Rompuy, described the advantages of international cooperation in the field of climate protection in his inaugural speech in 2009 as follows:

"*We are going through exceptionally difficult times: the financial crisis and its dramatic impact on employment and households, the climate crisis that threatens our survival. A time of fear, uncertainty and lack of trust. However, these problems can be overcome through joint efforts within and between our countries.*
2009 is also the first year of global governance, with the founding of the G20 in the midst of the financial crisis. The climate conference in Copenhagen is a further step towards the global management of our planet. Our mission is one of hope, supported by laws and actions."

Von Rompuy quantifies the year 2009 as the first year of "global governance." The first year of the corporatist, transnational model of rule, which serves only those who control it. At that time, the Director-General of the World Trade Organization (WTO), Pascal Lamy, took the same line, suggesting in a speech in Italy in November 2009 that international "global governance" based on the model of the EU should be established in the near future. Because this is the only way to stand up to the impending climate apocalypse.

Lamy is presumably working on this with his neo-feudal colleagues when, since 2000, he has regularly participated in the Bilderberg conferences, where one of those select circles of powerful people comes together, which then tells organizations such as the World Economic Forum (WEF) what priorities need to be set.

The intergenerational efforts of an elite clique of globalists are now reflected in the "rules-based international order" which those officials are constantly raving about these days. The fact that 150 Bilderberg members played a leading role in the implementation, enforcement and follow-up of the Covid infection regime speaks volumes in this regard.

However, the fake climate change narrative has one advantage over the other social engineering levers of the ruling caste—terrorism, Covid, the Ukraine conflict and the energy crisis—that it could become implausible to predict the apocalypse for another five decades while real climatic conditions are hardly changing at the same time. And "false flag operations" are also likely to be much more complicated in relation to natural disasters than blowing up a bridge or releasing a pathogen.

The Last Generation should therefore soon become aware of whose plans they are being used for.

The activists must realize that they and their future lives are not threatened by man-made climate change but by transhumanism, digital central bank money and biofascism. That they abolish themselves if they remain true to their course—and above all to their inhuman sponsors.

October 15, 2022

Coveted Coolness

Who is Elon Musk? What does he stand for? Quite a few consider him to be the messiah of libertarianism, an incarnation of Tony Stark, an inventive genius, a modern superhero. However, an analysis of his curriculum vitae, business relationships and goals gives every reason to believe that this image is a polished deception.

Elon Reeve Musk—with a fortune of around 204 billion US dollars, is currently the richest person in the world. At least if you believe the official rankings, which omit super-rich family dynasties such as the Rockefellers, Waltons, Morgans, Rothschilds or the Saudi royal family. Quite a few consider Musk to be the cool oligarch. As the easy-going, libertarian billionaire who is committed to freedom of expression on Twitter, calls for autonomy and freedom instead of Covid measures, who rails against "wokeness" at Netflix and smokes weed in front of the cameras on Joe Rogan, the world's widest-reaching podcaster.

Even people who are otherwise critical of excessive capital accumulation think he's kind of fascinating. After all, he builds chic, supposedly environmentally friendly electric cars with Tesla, wants to conquer Mars with Space X and, driven by bold inventiveness, solves the problems of public transport with a beefed-up subway concept called Hyperloop, uses Starlink to make the internet available anywhere in the world, and cures incurable diseases or disabilities with his Neuralink brain implants.

He advertises for the encrypted messenger service Signal, instead of Instagram or Facebook, and hoards the DOGE coins, which are only hip because of his media support. A cryptocurrency without a real "business case." Prodigy, tech nerd, eccentric genius, entrepreneurial jack-of-all-trades. This is the popular opinion. For *TIME* magazine, of course, the "Man of the Year 2021."

But who is Elon Musk? What is his motivation? Is the image as the incarnation of Tony Stark alias "Ironman"—a comic superhero from the Marvel cosmos—justified? After all, documentaries about the Silicon Valley entrepreneur are already being published under this title. The reverence of the billionaire as a kind of Leonardo da Vinci of postmodernism is taking on cult traits everywhere, with the media and fans portraying him in the light of a guru of the Fourth Industrial Revolution. As a man who, with his lofty visions, shows the way out of a dark, warlike era of destructive economic activity, cerebral overload and socio-economic turbulence.

Unfortunately, this generally cultivated enthusiasm for the mischievous-looking rock star among the super-rich seems to have a clouding effect on capturing the essence. Because a closer look at Musk's activities quickly shows that he just as rarely fulfills the expectations placed on him as he achieves his noble goals.

In addition, Musk's family background and questionable financial relationships raise legitimate doubts about the entrepreneur's supposedly humanitarian mission—even if, in stark contrast to other representatives of his caste such as Bill Gates, Michael Bloomberg, George Soros or Peter Thiel, he proclaims that the world has a problem with underpopulation. "Civilization will collapse if people don't have more children," he told the *New York Post* on December 7, 2021.

So, what does Elon Musk really stand for? What convictions underlie his actions? A look into the past helps to classify the activities of the start-up gambler. And the story of the richest person in the world begins amazingly in Switzerland. Because the ancestors of Elon Musk's mother come from the canton of Bern. From the small village of Signau in the Emmental. From this idyll of the Bernese Oberland, the family emigrated to the United States in the early 18th century under the name Haldimann. Later, they moved to Canada, where Elon Musk's mother was born Maye Haldenmann. His father, Errol Musk, made headlines in July 2022 when it was announced that the now 76-year-old has two children (born in 2018 and 2019) with his much younger stepdaughter Jana.

Elon Reeve Musk himself was born on June 28, 1971 in Pretoria (South Africa). There, Elon's father, whom Elon repeatedly described as a "terrible human being," ensured an adequate standard of living with an above-average income as an engineer.

His mother, as a former Canadian provincial model, took care of the household. But the most important figure in the Musks' family was probably Elon's grandfather, an engineer—Dr. Joshua Haldenmann—who had led the family from the United States to Canada to South Africa and set the tone as patriarch until his death. He probably had the greatest influence on young Elon, who developed a soft spot for technology under his aegis and taught himself programming at the tender age of ten.

Remarkable in this context: Dr. Joshua Haldenmann was an ardent supporter of the Technocracy movement, initially held the post of research director there and later even became the long-time chairman of the Technocracy, Inc. Canada. Elon Musk's most important male role model thus represented an ideology within the family unit that can be considered deeply inhumane.

Technocracy stands for modern absolutism. For a rule of machines and algorithms. For controlling the world through the energy consumption of its systems. On a macro and micro level. A reign of algorithms. In such a social model, *Homo sapiens* is little more than a slave to its own developments.

When the concept of technocracy was presented by Howard Scott in New York in 1917, it was of course not yet technically feasible. But this changed with the rapid development of the computing power of modern computers and is now leading to a digitization of the perceptible living space dominated by artificial intelligence.

As early as the 1970s, US high finance around David Rockefeller used its massive influence on Mao Zedong and made China a pilot project for the technocratically organized society of the future. With the support of the Nixon administration, the Anglo-American "Deep State" installed the infrastructure that helped China to rise economically and made today's totalitarian surveillance state possible in the first place. With the money of Wall Street, the know-how of the corporate oligarchy and the information of the secret services, China became a world power. And the first mature technocracy.

The results of half a century of inhumane tyranny in the Middle Kingdom are disturbing. Beijing's dystopian zero-Covid strategy, managed by barcodes, drones and robots, follows Howard Scott's models of thought exactly.

The same applies to the concepts of the green economy, the core goal of which is the automated control of all systems, indeed of the entire civilization, via their CO_2 consumption. It is not for nothing that Western politicians such as Robert Habeck or Justin Trudeau praise Xi Jinping's regime for its Covid strategy.

In view of these backgrounds, it should be thought-provoking when Elon Musk announced on Twitter on June 23, 2019: "*Accelerating Starship Development to Build the Martian Technocracy*." Because he knows exactly what that means. In addition, Elon Musk explicitly called for a carbon tax and increased control of individual mobility over its energy consumption. His fight for a liberally organized society seems to be limited to the digital space.

After all, after months of media spectacle, he has finally managed to buy the world's most important social media platform—the short messaging service Twitter. Because on October 26, 2022, he changed the job title of his profile, which is subscribed to by 110 million people, to "*Twitter Chef*." Musk then uploaded a video showing him entering the main Twitter building. Later, more photos circulated on the net in which he speaks to employees in the cafeteria of the tech company.

In the run-up to this 44 billion acquisition, the billionaire promised to restore freedom of expression on the platform after a radical left-wing interpretive elite had usurped public discourse with "wokeness" and cancel culture and negated, suppressed or censored any heterodoxy for years. The downside of this takeover: Elon Musk wants to verify every Twitter user as a "real person."

What that means is obvious. It's about the ID requirement in the digital space—about the end of the free, because anonymous internet.

This is by no means a libertarian position, but, like technocracy and carbon tracking, an outgrowth of a totalitarian concept of rule that eats its way into all areas of life like a nasty tumor through the digitization of everyday life.

Not to mention the fact that centralized, curated and documented communication—and all the big platforms stand for this—is the opposite of what is commonly understood by a free internet or private interaction.

But Musk not only calls for carbon taxes like Bill Gates or brain implants like Klaus Schwab, he also considers—like Barack Obama—a universal basic income to be practically inevitable. Likewise, not exactly a core idea of libertarianism. Even with regard to the obviously harmful mRNA injections, he does not represent the values based on humanism and enlightenment of those people who demand a right to bodily self-determination.

On the contrary, he is orchestrating a joint venture between his company Tesla and the Bill Gates-financed vaccine manufacturer CureVac to produce a new type of vaccine printer. 3D printing for injection cocktails, so to speak, based on the now established mRNA platform. With this development, Musk wants to ensure that people will receive their mRNA updates, which are succinctly referred to as "boosters," in the future in almost real time with the incidence of infection. And accept this invasive doctrine like a simple software update on the home computer. Not as a medically serious procedure. Although it is no longer possible to conceal even in the leading media that the mRNA products do more harm than good and that the entire vaccination campaign was built on lies.

Asked about his own Covid vaccination status, Musk initially told the *New York Post* that he would not get the shot. However, in the previously referenced article in *TIME* magazine on the topic of "Man of the Year," he stated that he had been vaccinated. Selective amnesia? Lie? We don't know.

In any case, Musk is now recommending the so-called vaccination without restriction, after initial reluctance.

Tony Stark, who is supposedly incarnated, treats human lives with similar carelessness when he argues that "humans must upgrade themselves because otherwise they run the risk of becoming a pet for robots." With this, Musk advocates for transhumanism. The next misanthropic ideology of the ruling caste, which the superficially cool billionaire appreciates and actively supports.

Elon Musk seems to be closer to the military-industrial complex, the secret services and US high finance than is generally known. Because he did not earn a large part of his fortune as a daring founder on the free market, but through subsidies, lucrative contracts with the United States Department of Defense, tax breaks and special loans from the United States government.

The fact that Elon Musk did not become a liberal-cool icon purely by chance is suggested by a look back at his early years as an entrepreneur. Because while there were a large number of more successful tech entrepreneurs in the legendary Silicon Valley at the end of the 1990s, it was Elon Musk, of all people, who was filmed for an absolutely vacuous guest appearance on CNN, so that for the first time a wider public had to take notice of him.

His first company—Zip2—which he founded in 1995 with his brother and another partner and sold to Compaq in February 1999 for about 300 million US dollars, was not the most revolutionary undertaking in the Californian IT Mecca. It was a simple phone book for the internet. Little more than a database in which companies could register in order to store their address on the internet.

Shortly before the aforementioned TV appearance in 1999, Elon Musk founded his second company, X.com, which merged shortly afterwards, in March 2000, with the already existing company PayPal, which in turn was founded in 1998 by Peter Thiel, Luke Nosek and Max Levchin.

Peter Thiel, who comes from Frankfurt am Main, is considered one of the most influential tech entrepreneurs and start-up financiers in the United States. And in the highly regulated banking business, no one succeeds with a financial service à la PayPal who has no reputation in the relevant circles. So Musk neither invented PayPal nor made it big. Thiel, on the other hand, was the head of an influential group of investors that later became known as "The PayPal Mafia" and controlled virtually all of Silicon Valley during the so-called dot-com boom of the 1990s. *Fortune Magazine* reported on November 26, 2007, in an article entitled "The PayPal Mafia," on the massive financial influence of the investor group around the actual PayPal founder on companies such as YouTube, Yelp or Facebook. Peter Thiel was the first major investor in the latter—and also Mark Zuckerberg's closest advisor for twenty years. Thiel is also invested in Reddit. Since 2021 also on Rumble. To name just a few.

Thiel is also a member of the Bilderberg Steering Committee and has participated in all meetings of the secretive globalist circle since 2008. Just like his business partner Alex Karp, with whom the ex-Frankfurt native founded a new company after the sale of PayPal to eBay in 2004: Palantir. A company for the development of technologies for mass surveillance.

Elon Musk had already founded Space X two years earlier, on March 14, 2002, and started working with the United States space program—that is, with the United States military. Musk was not

involved in Tesla Motors (now Tesla, Inc.) until February 2004. Indeed, following an online bank and a military service provider, Tesla was Musk's first civilian project. Thiel's Palantir Technologies works with the controversial British secret service GCHQ, among others. And, of course, with the United States intelligence services NSA and CIA, the United States Department of Homeland Security as well as American migration and customs authorities. Just like Facebook, which is merely a logical continuation of the CIA project Life Log, which had fallen into disrepute due to public uproar, and which was discontinued exactly one day before Facebook's market appearance on February 4, 2004 due to public pressure.

Peter Thiel, apparently Elon Musk's most influential business partner since 1999, has been working closely with governments, intelligence agencies, the military and their front organizations for at least two decades. In other words, with the deep state. Thiel is undoubtedly one of the most important financiers and architects of the attention economy, platform monopolism and the digital surveillance state. Investigative journalist James Corbett writes about Palantir Technologies on October 24, 2022:

"*Imagine a company that knows everything about everyone. A company that helps banks uncover fraud just as it helps intelligence agencies track down enemies of the state. A company that can combine images of you with your cell phone location data, emails you write, your medical records and credit card purchases, and thousands of other electronic data to paint an intimate portrait of your life—a portrait that any would-be investigator can view in a few clicks. A company that can target you anywhere in the world and at any time.*"

Now, of course, it would be dishonest to convict Elon Musk on the basis of contact guilt. The fact that he has been working closely

with Peter Thiel for over twenty years is not yet proof that he shares his obviously inhuman views, or—like Thiel—acts as an agent of a supranationally operating, corporatist deep state. And Space X could also have been created out of idealism, not as a service provider of US hegemony.

But perhaps the fact that Musk has been a member of the World Economic Forum's (WEF) Young Global Leaders program since 2008, which now has 3,800 graduates, raises one or two doubts about the billionaire's liberal façade. Even if he recently publicly declined the invitation to the WEF 2023. Or precisely because of it.

The fact that his well-calculated oeuvre as the incarnation of Tony Stark alias "Ironman" is no coincidence but, on the contrary, that the film was based on Musk in order to anchor this heroic-ingenious image of a nerdy inventor, tech star and superhero in the social consciousness, could also make you wonder. Robert Downey Jr., the lead actor of the Hollywood flick, met with Elon Musk several times in the run-up to filming to align his new role as Tony Stark with his personality.

The two toured Tesla production and Musk's personal offices together. When Downey returned to the production of *Ironman* on set, completely enthusiastic about Musk, he insisted on placing a Tesla in Tony Stark's workshop—which happened, as can be seen from the now completed blockbuster.

Perhaps accusations about Musk's Hyperloop also undermine faith in the sincerity of his supposedly humanistic motivated activities. Quite a few US journalists are now of the opinion that the Tesla manufacturer launched his tunnel construction project precipitously by design, namely as a way to prevent the

construction of a California high-speed rail line, which would have jeopardized the sale of his cars.

The suspicion is obvious. Because to this day, Musk's "boring company" that was supposed to realize the Hyperloop has nothing but a website and clumsy prototypes. And the railway line was never built.

A detailed article by journalist Paris Marx in *TIME* magazine on August 8, 2022 confirms such suspicions. Marx had met Elon Musk several times for interviews in the run-up to his publication and writes:

"*At the time, it seemed that Musk had only spread the Hyperloop proposal to get the public and lawmakers to reconsider the high-speed train. Actually, he didn't intend to build the thing. (...) As I wrote in my book, Musk admitted to his biographer Ashlee Vance that Hyperloop was just about getting lawmakers to cancel plans for a high-speed rail line in California—even though he had no plans to actually build the thing.*"

Elon Musk's tweet of July 24, 2020, in which he responded to the justified criticism of the US-driven coup d'état against Evo Morales in Bolivia due to the country's lithium deposits, also seems unsympathetic if not imperialistic: "*We will coup whoever we want! Deal with it.*" Finally, Musk's support for the Ukraine conflict is also not very humanistic or pacifist. Even though he likes to spread suggestions via Twitter to end the constantly escalating war.

Whether weapons, ammunition, logistics, information or satellite technology—more material prolongs the war. If you want peace, negotiate instead of pouring gasoline on the fire.

In addition, Musk's public statements tend to give the impression that he is making his Starlink technology available to the corrupt regime in Kiev completely altruistically and free of charge. This is not the case. The US government is paying Musk handsomely for the Starlink operation on Russia's external borders.

The same applies to the alleged non-governmental organization USAID (United States Agency for International Development), a cover company of the CIA for regime change and political agitation abroad. It is hardly surprising that Musk always acts in the spirit of Pax Americana.

After all, he and his company Space X regularly launch top-secret spy satellites into space for the military-industrial complex.

Elon Musk's high-profile interference in the conflict between China and Taiwan is also controversially discussed. For example, the entrepreneur proposed a "special administrative zone for Taiwan." China's ambassador to the United States immediately thanked Musk for this impulse, while Taiwan angrily announced that local "democracy cannot be bought."

Is Elon Musk really committed to peace in this regard—or is he simply guided by selfish motives when he takes a stance for China, since 30 to 50 percent of his vehicles are manufactured at the Shanghai production site?

Elon Musk grew up under the influence of a high-ranking technocrat, established contacts with influential circles at relevant US universities and worked with the powerful deep state agent Peter Thiel from 1999 at the latest. Since his nomination as a Young Global Leader in 2008, he has been a WEF adept. Musk obtained most of his fabulous fortune from the US government, works

for the CIA, NSA and US military when he launches their secret satellite technology into space, and researches mRNA infrastructure together with Bill Gates' company CureVac. His image as an equal incarnation of Tony Stark is a well-orchestrated illusion and media theatrics.

This already implies the rarely publicly discussed fact that Musk did not invent his most successful product—the Tesla—himself.

The concept was developed by the two inventors Marc Tarpenning and Martin Erberhard, who registered their joint venture on July 1, 2003 in San Carlos (California, USA).

Elon Musk only brought millions into the company and at some point, pushed the founders out.

In addition, Musk is sponsoring the war in Ukraine with technology paid for by the Pentagon. Because Starlink is nothing more than a front company that the United States military created in order not to have to take responsibility for illegitimate activities—as is common practice in corporatism these days. See Covid-19 and the pharmaceutical industry.

Musk is defrauding the public and his investors with Hyperloop to prevent Tesla sales from suffering from the offer of new public mass transit projects. He is taking over Twitter in order to introduce an identification procedure for "real accounts" on the already centralized and thus less libertarian communication platform.

He advocates transhumanism, carelessly abuses and kills great apes with his cruel Neuralink experiments, which violate morality and animal welfare thoughts, and soon wants to test his brain implants on human test subjects. Musk is interfering in

the conflict between China and Taiwan out of pure self-interest, only increasing the risk for the inhabitants of these countries of having to suffer an outbreak of violence between the two states.

Musk induces others to purchase a completely senseless and worthless cryptocurrency, which, like the entire crypto market, merely acts as a psychological preparation for digital central bank money, because the market capitalization, which has risen sharply in recent years, gives the impression that cryptocurrencies have real value. They don't. Like fiat money, they live on faith in the system.

Although it cannot be denied that projects like Monero can serve the concepts of a peer-2-peer economy—as long as electricity comes out of the socket.

Nevertheless, Musk encourages people to invest their savings in an extremely volatile market that will collapse sooner or later. This is because the central bankers will rigorously regulate the free crypto market as soon as the state digital currencies are rolled out nationwide.

A one-way street, then. Money flows in, but rarely back. Just like Musk's "boring company," which will never drill tunnels. Nor will he lead the sinking civilization to Mars with SpaceX or conquer foreign galaxies. No, Musk is not the conqueror of foreign worlds. His space transportation company has always worked closely with the Pentagon and NASA, which put tens of billions into SpaceX. Musk also employs former senior executives of the United States space agency, for example William Gerstenmaier, who was head of the manned spaceflight department from 2005 to 2019. It should not be forgotten that NASA spends 80 percent of its resources on projects of the military-industrial complex. For war.

The Tesla robot, anxiously and fanatically awaited worldwide, was presented just under three weeks ago. It, too, is an embarrassing failure that performs more miserably than the first prototypes of today's market leader Boston Dynamics over 20 years ago. As if that were not enough, he was in a relationship with the artist Grimes until March 2022, who publicly raves about how a mature "artificial intelligence" will finally lead to a communist utopia.

No less irritating is the fact that Musk had several contacts with the convicted human trafficker Ghislaine Maxwell, the left hand of the mysteriously deceased Jeffrey Epstein, a pedophile sex and financial offender, rapist, blackmailer and VIP pimp, whose Lolita Express client list, though not yet fully disclosed, includes such illustrious names as Bill Gates, Bill Clinton, Donald Trump, Prince Andrew, US Senator John Glenn, Chris Tucker, Naomi Campbell and Kevin Spacey. Musk initially vehemently denied knowing Ghislaine Maxwell at all, but shortly afterwards relativized these statements, only to become entangled in further contradictions regarding his relationship with Epstein's most important aide.

In light of these circumstances, it seems unrealistic if not naïve to believe that Elon Musk came on the scene to save freedom of expression or even the entire civilization. It is more obvious that he was "built up" by appropriate interest groups in order to protect the narrative of the rulers from the desire for freedom of sovereign individuals.

Because his image of the liberal inventor, composed of recycled scraps of meaning, enables Musk to inspire precisely those population groups with the goals of oligarchs, technocrats, transhumanists and imperialists who are generally rather critical of them. Anyone who rejects "wokeness" easily falls prey to the fallacy of being able to join the liberal-tinged Elon deference with a clear

conscience. Although the respective goals are identical and only the marketing campaigns or feel-good phrases diverge slightly.

Yes—Elon Musk comes across as a bit cooler than a Bill Gates or George Soros. But no, he is not the future or the liberal savior. No one will come to save civilization from itself and a technocratic-totalitarian, supranational corporatism, a caste system of the rules-based international order. The Musk case merely illustrates once again that the socio-economic and political crises of these days are not conflicts of political spectrum. The "Zeitenwende" initiated by neo-feudalists is not about left or right, but about up and down.

And the path towards a more auspicious time must be taken by each individual. Ideally, now, and resolutely. Then the stream of compliant followers would ebb away at some point, because the liberally organized civil society that emerges in this way would be more attractive than digital despotism, and would not be—as George Orwell predicted—"*moving with almost deadly certainty towards an age of totalitarian dictatorships.*"

October 30, 2022

Meet: Bertrand Russell

The first part of a loose series of portraits that aims to use historical contextualization and a closer look at influential people of the past to try to make developments of the present appear in a clearer light.

Although it has become abundantly clear over the past decade that the nation state has long since been disempowered and that government power has been transferred—directly and indirectly—to supranational organizations such as the United Nations (UN), quite a few still believe that the socio-economic challenges of these days can be overcome by resisting the local government. Unfortunately, however, world government, which is frowned upon as a "conspiracy theory," is already a reality. For a long time.

For even if the nation-state power apparatuses continue to function as executives and unwaveringly perform the outrageous farce of representative democracy, they have long since ceased to define the strategy on which economic, social or political transformation processes are oriented. The status quo, the turning point, the new normal, stakeholder capitalism—all these marketing terms stand for one and the same thing: the realization of totalitarian, imperialist and eugenic-influenced concepts of domination that were put on paper by influential thinkers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Therefore, it is worthwhile to take a closer look at the said period and group of people from time to time.

A look at the writings of this period, which are often negated today, proves that the current developments are by no means organic in nature, coincidence, fate or coincidence, but the results of calculated, supranational striving for power. An examination of one-hundred-year-old ideas for the governance of human civilization produces a chaotic-dystopian image of a disruptive postmodernism with sharp contours, transfigured by the flood of information.

This first of my series of revealing portraits entitled “Allow me introduce,” which ideally encourage the reader to do further research, is dedicated to Bertrand Russel, a supposed leading figure of pacifism. Born in Wales in 1872, the Briton was primarily active as a philosopher, mathematician and logician, according to relevant encyclopedias. In 1950, he was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature. Initially, however, he spent a lonely youth. Because both his parents and sister died when Russell was just three years old. He grew up with his grandparents together with his brother. There the children were taught by an atheist tutor. They were not allowed to attend a public school because the grandparents wanted to shield their offspring from the influence of religion, which was considered a serious evil in the Russell household. When his grandfather died in 1878 and his brother in 1931, Bertrand Russell inherited the title of the male line of the family and became an earl.

A scholarship helped the 28-year-old Russell to study mathematics at the University of Cambridge. He did this from 1890 to 1894. He then received a fellowship from the university, which enabled him to conduct research there until 1901 without any binding

obligations. Afterwards, interrupted only briefly by a short intermezzo as an embassy employee in Paris, he devoted himself to theoretical work as a mathematician, philosopher and writer.

A little later, Russell wrote the *Principia Mathematica*, published in several parts from 1910 to 1913, one of the most important works of the twentieth century in this field. In addition, he published a large number of books, essays, pamphlets and correspondence in the course of his life, which still shape his public image today. Russell was an atheist and criticized any form of religious belief.

On the other hand, he was enthusiastic about socialism. Especially for the so-called guild-socialism. In 1922 and 1923 he ran for the social democratic Labour Party, one of the three major parties in the United Kingdom, founded in 1900. However, without success. He has taught at Cambridge University, the London School of Economics, Harvard University and Peking University.

"*People are born ignorant, not stupid. They are made stupid by their education*," he wrote in 1946 on page 578 of his book *History of Western Philosophy—Collector's Edition*.

If one focuses on this widely known information on Bertrand Russel's life, there are understandably hardly any doubts about the image of the supposed icon. All too often, the media portrayal conceals the fact that the Briton, who died in 1970, was neither a pacifist nor a Social Democrat. He spoke out against the war only at the time of the First World War. Even during the Second World War, he no longer wanted to know anything about pacifism.

On the contrary, after the end of the war, he called for a devastating preemptive strike against the Soviet Union, which at that time did not yet possess nuclear weapons. According to

his own statement, to save human civilization from a nuclear holocaust in the future.

It is not without reason that this argumentative position is reminiscent of today's attempts to justify the constant continuation of the spiral of escalation in the context of the Ukraine crisis.

NATO, the North Atlantic "defense alliance," as the Western imperialist expansion apparatus euphemistically calls itself, also justifies its confrontational course against Putin with peacekeeping. Russia must be destroyed, must be wiped out before it can destroy us—that is the doctrine of action.

A strategy whose geoeconomic dimension very few perceive—or want to admit. The fact that war is good business for the international banking cartels and the military-industrial complex is still clear even to some supporters of NATO's aggressive course. However, it seems unrealistic to most people that the desired result of a military conflict is not to achieve victory but instead the lasting destabilization of specific regions. Because they continue to assume that the 193 member states of the United Nations (UN) decide and act autonomously.

"Your obedience is boundless, and, I have to tell you, it is becoming more and more unforgivable every day." (Thomas Mann)

To a certain extent, this is of course the case. But as the Covid crisis has already shown, institutions such as the World Health Organization (WHO) easily override any national legislation when corresponding scenarios occur and the exemption rules contractually agreed by the UN member states take effect. In this way, institutional globalism is shaped around the narratives of a segregatively thinking interpretive elite.

After World War II, international peace was at stake, which justified the creation of the UN in 1945.

After the publication of *The Limits to Growth*, the climate apocalypse manifesto of the Rockefellerian Club of Rome based in Winterthur (Switzerland), environmental protection was the topic of the hour from 1972 onwards.

This, in turn, led to the founding of the IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) in Geneva (Switzerland) in 1988. Since its founding, the panel has claimed—and possesses—the sole sovereignty of interpretation, primacy and dictate in matters of man-made climate change. Although in the wake of the Climategate scandal it became clear as early as 2009 that the corresponding climate models are manipulated and misused to achieve political goals.

At the same time, the democratically illegitimate sub-organization of the UNEP (United Nations Environment Program), founded in 1972, has been exerting massive influence on the course of the world. Because without its reports, each one more panicky than the other, there would be neither a "green economy" nor a "net-zero course" in terms of CO_2, which now influences practically every aspect of human existence.

In this way, crises and military conflicts always promote the strengthening of global governance—the neo-feudal construct of corporatist technocracy that is conceived and ideologically underpinned by the UN, its 17 specialized agencies and an armada of non-governmental organizations and think tanks in order to manifest itself in an unholy symbiosis of corporate oligarchy and state power.

The fact that it is precisely this faceless international form of organization that has been the long-term goal of Anglo-American financial elites for at least 100 years is shown not only by a large number of renowned authors such as Carroll Quigley or Antony C. Sutton but also by original documents by Cecil Rhodes, Henry Ford, John D. Rockefeller and UNESCO. And also some lesser-known works by Bertrand Russell, which are often omitted from the bibliography of official advocacy.

The odd Welsh thinker mustered verve above all when it came to global top-down solutions for social, political or financial challenges.

The fact that Russell did not necessarily feel committed to the common good is suggested by his memberships in feudal-elitist organizations. Among other things, he was part of the Cambridge Apostles, a secret society of intellectual circles at the University of Cambridge that had been active until then, and the Fabian Society, a socialist group that, according to the guidelines of Fabianism, focuses on the "*further development of socialist ideas through constant influence on powerful intellectual circles and groups.*"

The goal: socio-cultural evolution, instead of revolution. The constitution of the Fabian Society was put down on paper by eugenics enthusiast George Bernard Shaw. Since the writer H. G. Wells, who was fascinated by the controlled breeding of *Homo sapiens*, was also a member of the Fabians, it can be assumed that Bertrand Russell was not necessarily in the company of vetted humanists. For the Fabian Society made it clear from the beginning that it was interested in the centrally coordinated optimization of humans, as the book *Weeding the Garden: The Eugenics Reception of the Early Fabian Society* by Sören Niemann-Findeisen (2004) describes in detail.

Bertrand Russell's worldview is also based on the exaltation, the intrinsic claim to domination of a ruling class of chosen ones over the common people. This is shown by his two books, *Principles of Social Reconstruction* (1916) and *The Scientific Outlook* (1954).

The former includes the chapters "War as an Institution," "Property," "Education," "Marriage and the Population Question" and "Religion and the Churches."

The world Russell describes in his book, published in 1916, is strikingly similar to the postulate of a golden age of "rules-based international order" that organizations such as the World Economic Forum (WEF) or the UN are declaring in 2022.

On page 105, Russell writes: "*In order to prevent war and at the same time preserve freedom, it is necessary that there should be only one military state in the world; and that disputes between different countries should be dealt with according to the decision of a central authority. This structure, of course, requires a world federation*, (...)."

His recommendations for action sound like the blueprint for the supranationally constituted empire of postmodernism. Some 73 pages later in the text, it is about population development.

"*In France, population growth is practically stagnating. And it will soon be the same in England. This means that some populations are shrinking while others are increasing. If there is no change, the shrinking groups will die out and the population will be replenished almost entirely from the now increasing sections of the population.*

The dwindling groups include the entire middle class as well as the experienced craftsmen. The groups that are increasing are the

very poor, the sluggish and drunk, the feeble-minded. (…) It is not the decline in births per se that is regrettable, but the fact that the decline is greatest in the best strata of the population."

The Eugenics Archive Canada writes about Bertrand Russell's attitude to eugenics:

"*He criticized the early eugenicists for oversimplifying heredity, for implying that the rich are genetically superior to the poor, and for supporting racial stereotypes (Russell, 1957).*

However, Russell supported certain aspects of eugenics and believed that it should not be ignored. He feared that the quality of the human race would deteriorate, so he supported certain eugenic practices (Ironside, 2006). For example, he wrote that so-called feeble-minded persons should be sterilized because they tended to have an enormous number of illegitimate children, who were usually completely useless to the community" (Russell, 1957, p. 259).

Only one year after the publication of *Russel's Principles of Social Reconstruction*, the Technocracy Movement was founded in New York, which—consciously or unconsciously—took up and developed his ideas of a world federation and an all-powerful military state.

The technocrats supplemented the still lifeless organizational chart of Russel's world government with those levers and control processes that were to enable global control over the civilization of the technology-dominated future. The prototype of this inhumane system of totalitarian surveillance can be "admired" in China today.

Some 38 years after his proposals for socio-cultural evolution, Bertrand Russell was more explicit. In *The Scientific Outlook* of

1954, he explicitly refers to the concepts of Howard Scott's technocracy movement when he no longer speaks of sovereign states and governments, but of "*centralist and scientific government*," of "*scientific dictatorship*," and of "*world government*" instead of a "*world federation*."

Russell speaks out in favor of collectivist and totalitarian social designs. And in terms of private property and education, he also struck a harsher tone in 1954 than in his work published in 1916.

Short excerpts from the chapter "Scientific Government" illustrate the thrust:

"*Anyone who dreams of a scientifically organized world and wants to put his dream into practice is confronted with many obstacles. There is the resistance of inertia and habit. People want to live the way they have always done. (...) Then there is resistance out of legitimate interest: an economic system inherited from feudal times gives advantages to men who have done nothing to deserve them. (...) In addition to these forces, there are also hostile idealisms. Christian ethics stands in contrast to certain basic features of scientific ethics, which is visibly maturing. Christianity recognizes the importance of the individual and his soul and is not willing to sacrifice innocent people for a goal of community*." (pp. 240, 241)

"*The company of experts I imagine will include all the eminent men of science, with the exception of a few stupid, anarchic crackpots. It will be the only power to possess the latest weaponry and will be the keeper of all the new secrets of the art of war. So there will be no more war, because resistance from the unscientific is doomed to obvious failure. The expert society will control propaganda and education. It will teach loyalty to the world government and make nationalism a treason. The government, which will be an oligarchy, will instill*

subservience in the great mass of the population, and will limit the authority of action and command to its own members." (p. 243)

"*When* (...) *the world government that we have in mind will be created, one of its first tasks will be the international organization of production.* (...) *By eliminating competition and concentrating production on a single company, all this waste could be avoided.*" (p. 247)

"*Raw materials should not belong to those who, through conquest or diplomacy, have accidentally acquired the territory in which they are located. They should belong to a world authority that would ration them* (...)." (p. 248)

Bertrand Russel's seven-decade-old concepts are strikingly similar to those of the United Nations or the World Economic Forum. But Russell makes no secret of the form of government this amounts to. While Klaus Schwab, the head of the WEF, is trying hard to distract the audience from the core of his statements with linguistic tightrope walks and straw man arguments.

Russel's totalitarian visions—as well as those of the Technocracy Movement—seem to be becoming reality these days. Even if there is currently more than one corporation and raw materials are not yet managed by a world authority.

However, due to the concentration of capital in a handful of asset management companies, which in turn influence or control every listed company, the homemade energy crisis, the resulting supply chain problems and a pronounced corporatism, we are probably not too far away from this scenario. The creeping seizure of power by the UN, WHO, World Bank, IMF and Co. picks up speed with every disruption and makes autonomous states de facto obsolete.

And the reproductive medicine ideas of Bertrand Russell and his Fabian Society are also bearing fruit. They assimilate health care and civil society under euphemistic labels such as "biosocial research," bioethics, transhumanism, demographic research, "planned parenthood" or the "queer" movement. Controlled breeding of *Homo sapiens* and abolition of the individual in the dazzling garb of postmodernism. It is not for nothing that research on the human genome and its optimization for the turn of an era is now the focus of the financiers of a scientific community usurped by funding and subsidies.

They seem to be guided by the concepts of questionable pioneers of the early twentieth century. In the chapter "Scientific Reproduction" of his book *The Scientific Outlook*, published in 1954, Russell describes it as follows:

"*If the simultaneous regulation of quantity and quality is taken seriously in the future, we can expect that in each generation about 25 percent of women and about five percent of men will be chosen as parents of the next generation.*
The rest of the population will be sterilized, which will not affect their sexual pleasures in any way. (...) *Fathers, of course, have nothing to do with their own children. For every five mothers, there would generally be only one father, and it is very likely that he would never have seen the mothers of his children. The feeling of fatherhood would thus disappear completely. Probably, over time, the same would happen, albeit to a slightly lesser extent, in relation to mothers. If the birth were induced prematurely and the child was separated from its mother at birth, the feeling of motherhood would have little chance of developing.* (...) *Due to sterilization, love affairs do not have to have unpleasant consequences, as long as they do not take place between a man and a woman who are non-sterile. In this way, the working class can be given a carefree and frivolous pleasure* (...)." (p. 261, ff)

The two referenced works of the Nobel Prize winner still offer a large number of such quotations, imbued with inhumanity. The pages are dripping with the lordly arrogance of exaggerated thinking. It is obvious that Russell was not concerned with humanism, pacifism or democracy. Even if the flowery words of his celebrated publications like to give this impression. He advocated for neo-feudal, segregative and eugenic concepts. For a totalitarian world government, an imperialist military state, led by "recognized" specialists, masterminds and governors appointed by the elite.

He spoke in favor of targeted breeding of humans, outclassed disadvantaged population groups and denied them the right to exist. He called for the preventive destruction of Russia and categorized peoples according to their cost-benefit balance for the global collective he wanted for the future. Russell was thus part of a secretive movement from the ranks of Anglo-Saxon high finance that had set itself the goal of restoring the global dominance of the British Empire at the end of the 19th century—in the form of a global collectivism shaped by communist ideas. However, the envisaged social and economic model was to be marketed as representative democracy.

The aim was to drive this in the desired direction by influencing education, science, business and politics. They had the means to do so.

In this context, not only two books by Caroll Quigley—*Tragedy and Hope* (1966) and *The Anglo-American Establishment* (1981)—or those by Antony C. Sutton on the influence of Wall Street capital on recent history are illuminating, but also two little-noticed publications by the United States author John A. Stormer—*Non Dare Call it Treason* (1964) and *None Dare Call it Education* (1998).

For they document in detail and on the basis of original sources how Anglo-American interest groups advanced the realization of the visions of Russel, Shaw, Ford, Wells, Howard Scott, Edward Bernays et al. over the course of the past century. And successfully. The present speaks for itself.

The financial infiltration of the education system, the establishment of scholarships, the founding and takeover of universities, and an academic establishment corrupted by high finance were the key to the cross-generational change in society. And thus, of man himself.

It is not for nothing that the industrial and financial moguls of the early twentieth century paid special attention to the education sector and founded one foundation after another. Especially in the United States, they had a direct influence on the organization of the education system and the content of teaching. And thus, also to the past, the present and the future. Following the motto: History is written by the winners.

In retrospect, a continuity can be seen with regard to geostrategic, geoeconomic and civilizational development, the program of which seems downright foolish to describe as a coincidence, so obvious are the financial, temporal and organizational connections.

What is remarkable—and regrettable—is that more people are not aware of the fact that they are governed by castes and networks whose intellectual role models are everything but democrats and humanists. A circumstance that can be countered by a regular look into the past, the pointing out of historical contexts and references to relevant literature.

"The closer the collapse of an empire gets, the crazier its laws."
(Marcus Tullius Cicero)

November 6, 2022

Bubble Factory Hollywood

"I'm only here in Hollywood for one reason, because I don't have the moral fortitude to refuse the money." (Marlon Brando)

Once upon a time, there was a Canadian-American retailer. He was born in Toronto in 1847 and later made a career in the United States. After initially trying to earn money in Chicago with a hardware store and a candy store, but felt called to higher things, he switched to the real estate industry. He became the property manager for the Rock Island Railroad, where he was responsible for land development and eventually made it to the board.

Hobart Johnstone Whitley, as he was called, had made it from humble beginnings. In 1893, he moved to California and settled in Los Angeles, where he opened a jewelry store a year later. At some point, Whitley bought 480 hectares of undeveloped land at the gates of the then comparatively manageable metropolis. Just 18 families lived there at that time. Wasteland, so to speak. Whitley, however, already saw in his mind's eye a new city emerging on the rural floe, a booming suburb.

The wasteland to be developed outside LA was named by Daeida Wilcox, daughter of a wealthy landowner, who provided additional land for the project. Daeida had heard of a country estate in Illinois that bore the name "Hollywood" and adopted

the name for the new settlement without further ado. Wilcox is considered the official founder of the commune and is responsible for building the entire initial infrastructure of the young town. Town hall, post office, police station, city park, tennis club and even two banks.

Daeida Wilcox was a jack of all trades. And H. J. Whitley seemed to have had the right nose. Because the once 18 families on a greenfield site quickly became a lively suburb. Whitley became rich. As early as 1902, only eight years after he had acquired a few hundred hectares of Pampa, he built the legendary Hollywood Hotel right there—on Hollywood Boulevard. A house that became a mythical hotspot for celebrities with the settlement of the film industry from 1910 onwards.

In 1912, when Oklahoma was officially admitted to the United States after the suppression of the indigenous people, the entrepreneur Whitley was even proposed as the first governor of the new US state. Daeida Wilcox died in 1914. And on the formerly meaningless farmland, the legendary and wicked center of the United States film industry was created. To this day, Hollywood dominates the world market from this patch of earth and produces predictive blockbusters that shape the zeitgeist. Columbia Pictures, Warner Bros., Paramount, Universal and Disney—everyone knows the "big five" from the opening credits of their favorite blockbuster. The five big studios. And the numerous scandals about stars and starlets that have always filled front pages or gossip columns. The stories range from simple affairs to fraud and corruption to murder. Wealth, decadence, excessiveness and moral abysses retrospectively paint a picture of a cesspool of sin that has gotten out of control. The greater Los Angeles area was the setting for many a real crime thriller that etched itself into the collective memory.

Whether Charles Manson and his Manson Family in the 1960s, the death of Blues Brother John Belushi in 1982, the grotesque murder trial of O. J. Simpson in the mid-90s, the death of Michael Jackson in June 2009, the death of Paul Walker four years later or the strange car accident of Anne Heche, who announced shortly before her tragic death in the summer of 2022, to want to publish a documentary about pedophile machinations in Hollywood. The "City of Angels" seems to bring the darkest sides of man to light again and again.

In the dream factory, there is nothing that does not exist. No idea is too bizarre not to find an equivalent in reality. From wild orgies at Jack Nicholson's and fetish parties in special VIP sex clubs, to drug excesses with Charlie Sheen, to occult practices and Satanism.

As grotesque, repulsive and amoral as the circumstances may be, no one is surprised anymore. Society has come to terms with it, delights in the scandals.

From the suffering of others. And yellow journalism continues to print—or clickbait—with the fate, misfortune or death of Hollywood celebrities and their often shady environment in the billion-dollar film industry.

The fact that you can only succeed as a young actor in LA if you have the right contacts, often established and consolidated on the so-called casting couch, is also a fact and widely known. Ethics and morals stay at a far distance from the Californian hotspot. They are replaced by greed and power. The film industry, always on the lookout for new stars, magically attracts young people.

In the stranglehold of their craving for recognition, they give everything—first and foremost, usually their dignity—to belong

to that tiny group that rises from humiliating castings to the spheres of superstardom.

Just five years ago, the sex and abuse scandal surrounding film producer Harvey Weinstein was on everyone's lips for months and gave a massive boost to the "MeToo" movement, whose avalanche of revelations brought down over 200 influential men in Hollywood, according to the *New York Times* of October 29, 2018. In addition to Weinstein, Oliver Stone, Larry King, Silvester Stallone, Richard Dreyfuss, John Travolta, Charlie Sheen, Steven Seagal, Russell Simmons, Nick Carter, Dustin Hoffman, Ben Affleck and Kevin Spacey were also accused of sexual assault, coercion or rape.

The notorious financial fraudster, CIA collaborator, sex offender, pederast and human trafficker Jeffrey Epstein, who recently died under questionable circumstances, also liked to romp around in the "city of dreams." His left hand, the industrialist's daughter Ghislaine Maxwell, who was imprisoned for human trafficking, and the well-connected New York publicist Peggy Siegal ensured that Epstein gained access to the top events of local high society and was on the relevant guest lists. Siegal was considered in the scene to be the "*best way to ensure that a film wins an Oscar*," *Business Insider* reported on July 22, 2019.

Pedophile activities are apparently not uncommon in the illustrious circle of screen heroes, their entourage and producers. The aforementioned Anne Heche had taken up the topic and wanted to shed light on the proverbial darkness by means of a documentary, before her electric car, according to official information and for unexplained reasons, was no longer controllable and she drove into a wall without braking. Of interest is that the CIA boasted, as late as 2017, of wanting to use this very method to eliminate "security risks" unnoticed.

Apparently, Paul Walker also wanted to break with Hollywood before he died in a car accident. Like Chester Benning, the singer of the band Linkin Park who died by hanging in 2017, Walker is said to have worked to uncover pedophile machinations in the Californian film industry. The 42-year-old actor Isaac Kappy, who publicly spoke out against child abuse and satanic sexual practices with minors in Hollywood, also died in 2019.

Actor Corey Feldman also speaks of childhood abuse. In 2019, he told the music magazine *Rolling Stone* in detail about his own experiences.

At the age of eleven, he was forced to have anal intercourse with adults on the set of a film. "*That's what all the boys do here*," they revealed to him. We was told that sexual acts with older people were normal and helped to make progress in the network.

Hollywood's dark secrets, however, are not limited to the apparently institutional abuse of the individual. The dream factory also exerts a targeted influence on the collective. And this under the aegis of the governments in Washington and London. According to the English newspaper *The Independent*, analyses show that more than 1,100 feature films produced in the blockbuster Mecca received funding from the Pentagon, in other words, the United States Department of Defense. Of those, 900 received such funding since 2005.

At least 410 productions were directly influenced or monitored by the military apparatus in terms of plot, presentation and social impact. According to declassified documents from the United States government, there are probably twice as many. As recently as 2017, various leading media reported in detail on the unhealthy closeness between Hollywood, the intelligence services and the United States military.

The assumption is obvious that the military-industrial complex uses the medium of film to subliminally ventilate its manipulative propaganda messages and to indoctrinate the population on a large scale. It is not for nothing that some films seem strangely prophetic in retrospect. It is social engineering by means of normative fiction and "predictive programming," as Ken Ammi explains in his book *Transhuman Hollywood* from 2019.

"Hollywood is a place where they pay you a thousand dollars for a kiss and fifty cents for your soul." (Marilyn Monroe)

The visual experience on the screen prepares people for what is to come, for what is planned, by showing them thought patterns and patterns of action that they should imitate in the event that a corresponding event occurs. Edward Bernays, nephew of Sigmund Freud and father of professional propaganda since 1928, thanks to his book of the same name, called Hollywood "*the largest and most effective propaganda machine in the world.*"

The plot of the major movies also always follows hegemonic narratives of Anglo-American-dominated imperialism and thus automatically conveys the one-dimensional worldview of the West. See Sean Penn, actor and former husband of Madonna, who visited Kiev for the second time last week. This time to hand the Pandora Papers President Zelenskyy one of his two Oscars, highly mediatized, and thus create images that support NATO's course.

George Clooney—like countless other VIPs—is also committed to the organizations of globalized capital. Since 2006, he has been supporting the United Nations (UN), including in matters of Darfur and Chad. Or Angelina Jolie, who became a member of the notorious Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) in 2007 and

is a special ambassador for the UNHCR (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees).

In addition, there is evidence of conversations and secret meetings of the actress with the CIA and the head of the British secret service MI6. In January 2021, an expert commented in the newspaper *The U.S. Sun* that, after reviewing all available evidence, he came to the conclusion that Angelina Jolie was active as a spy.

In this way, invisible forces in the background of dazzling imagery change the subjective perception of reality. Social structures and core processes are affected, mutating insidiously under the gentle pressure of the moving image.

In that context, neither the Marlboro Man nor Uncle Ben's rice nor the Würth calendar spruced up with scantily clad models are no longer socially acceptable today. Yet war for peace and the premature sexualization of children is, as evidenced by a school system usurped by wokeness or by Netflix and its controversial series.

The latent aversion of the Western population towards Russia or Arab countries can also be attributed to the fact that these countries are portrayed as the villain in almost all thrillers with a corresponding storyline. In this way, Hollywood subtly influences the way people perceive their environment, their living space, the respective culture, their society and their future options. Not to mention "product placement," in other words, covert advertising by large consumer brands, which is intended to create unconscious incentives to consume in almost every film.

Up to this point, however, these are rather superficial, quite obvious examples that show how zeitgeist, pop culture and

consumer behavior are changing surely but steadily through audiovisual indoctrination. And this without the sovereign actively voting for these transformation processes. Images are a weapon in the post-truth media age. They are used against the primary enemy of technocratic neo-feudalism—its own population.

Contrary to popular assumptions, the world's defense ministries invest a large part of their budgets in combating "internal threats." In asynchronous warfare against one's own people. Not in securing the borders or for world peace.

In the case of the United States, this is illustrated by a presentation by NASA scientist Dennis Bushnell from 2001. The 113-page presentation is devoted almost exclusively to this topic and, significantly, pins the beginning of the "*age of NANO technology*" precisely to the year 2020. He also predicted subsequent disruption and massive social upheavals, and a new form of society for the year 2025. In view of Bushnell's research assignment with the space agency, it becomes clear why 80 percent of NASA's resources go to military projects instead of to the exploration of the infinite expanses of space—and why the United States government prefers to hide these projects behind the innocent white façade of "space shuttles" and lunar missions rather than have them supervised by the Pentagon.

The few publicly available lectures by the NASA veteran, who has been employed by the United States space agency since the Apollo programs, are disturbing. Compared to Dennis Bushnell's visions of transhumanism and psychological warfare, the WEF "mastermind" Yuval Noah Harari, who argues about the abolition of *Homo sapiens*, seems harmless in places.

The research field of Dennis Bushnell, who has his office not at the Cape Canaveral spaceport but at NASA's Langley Research Center, just a stone's throw from the CIA headquarters, makes it clear what threat the internal enemy must pose to the power apparatus of the state. Therefore, Bushnell's focus is probably on "Trojan Horse Civilian Systems"—weapons systems that are rolled out as civilian projects.

For example, in healthcare. The American DARPA (Defense Advanced Research Projects), where mRNA technology has been researched for years in the "bioweapons" category, for example, pursues identical strategic goals. The mRNA vaccine manufacturer Moderna can certainly be understood as a "spin-off" of the Ministry of Defense. The company exploits the patents developed for the military as a platform technology for the Covid-19 injections and continues to receive millions of dollars from DARPA.

"Public private partnerships" like in Hollywood. Because the film industry—just like big pharma, big tech, the telecommunications industry or the energy industry—is corrupted by the military-industrial complex. In the stakeholder capitalism of our time, the corporate oligarchy acts as an extended workbench of the state. As an economic-digital executive of the technocratic model of rule. So it is hardly surprising that influential circles perfidiously instrumentalize Hollywood's staged imagery to stimulate their social engineering efforts. Radio, television, cinema, PC and smartphone are the weapons of mass destruction of the media age.

How far the amoral ruling caste (in show business) will go to maintain the enchantment of the chimera that is presented to humanity as reality is exemplified by the "Kanye West" case. The American producer, rapper and designer, who now only calls himself "Ye," is one of the most successful superstars of our era and

perhaps the richest African-American of all time. Until recently, he was in a relationship with the selfie plague Kim Kardashian, of whom it is still unknown how she could have achieved such a degree of fame in the first place.

Whatever "Ye West" touched turned to gold. At least so far. Because ever since he said he found God in 2019, and has since been increasingly openly and fearlessly criticizing the establishment and the music industry, calling the mRNA injection a sign of Satan, speaking out against centralist mass media and taking a clear stand against international high finance, one shitstorm has chased the next. Grammy appearances are canceled, social media services such as Twitter and Instagram regularly block him, major concerts are canceled, documentaries are not broadcast, brands such as adidas, Gap or Balenciaga unilaterally end their lucrative collaboration contracts with the world star, JPMorgan blocks his bank account. The system has declared war on him.

> **To find out who is controlling you, just find out who you are not allowed to criticize.**

Admittedly, his criticism is not very differentiated, clumsily formulated and too superficial. Ye accuses "*Jewish-controlled*" media, banking cartels and pharmaceutical companies of conspiring against humanity, making his justified criticism of monopolism the target for slamming him with the predictable label of being an anti-Semite. He is, hence, reaping that onslaught, perhaps rightly so, because his one-dimensional argumentation simply lacks substance. He should have read a few books before challenging the entire system of corrupt oligarchy before the eyes of the world.

Nevertheless, he is basically right. In fact, the boardrooms of the US music and media industry are mainly made up of people of

Jewish descent and earn a lot of money with rap music, which glorifies the real fate of large parts of the black population in ghettos and prisons as a cool "gangster lifestyle." In 2017, the African-American musician Lupe Fiasco had already criticized this in one of his lyrics. It is also true that Jewish bankers are among the most influential people in the world and that the United States financial system is dominated by members of that religious circle.

Nevertheless, it is foolish and one-dimensional to blame religion or ethnicity for the conditions that Ye is currently so fearlessly dragging into the public eye. The superstar fails to recognize that it is not creeds that drive the criminal corporatists, but greed. A motivation that knows neither political spectrums nor red lines or moral coordinate systems.

Ye had already "pulled out" in 2016, had given free rein to his pent-up frustration with the music industry and many a mainstream musician, and had expressed his opinion about social grievances unfiltered.

In addition, he already caused head-shaking in the circle of his fellow artists as well as in the Black community when he announced that he wanted to support Donald Trump instead of Hillary Clinton as presidential candidate.

The displeasure that Ye caused with his behavior in influential circles apparently became his undoing. According to the official version, the superstar has been suffering from mental problems since 2016. He was diagnosed with bipolar personality disorder, and since then he has been said to be insane or not in full possession of his mental faculties. So in 2016, besieged by a horde of paparazzi and the local tabloid press, he ended up in a psychiatric

ward. His portrayal in the media has been controversial ever since. From "everybody's darling" to confused freak. The admission to the psychiatric hospital, a coercive measure that Ye apparently refused in view of the handcuffs he wore during the transport, was arranged by his personal trainer—Harley Pasternak—who made the appropriate calls and had the artist taken away from his home incapacitated.

But who is Harley Pasternak? How does he get into the position of getting his celebrity client committed and put on psychotropic drugs? A closer look at the CV of the supposed fitness coach provides clarity and shows how the "superstar system" works in Hollywood. Ye is not the only world-famous customer of Pasternak. If you follow the narrative of the leading media, he is nothing more than a very successful fitness trainer and nutrition specialist. Until a few days ago, you could read on Pasternak's now archived Wikipedia page that he looks after the following superstars, among others:

"*Adam Levine, Lady Gaga, Kim Kardashian, Kanye West, Megan Fox, John Mayer, Amy Schumer, Ariana Grande, Jessica Simpson, Julianne Hough, Robert Pattinson, Pusha T, Gwyneth Paltrow, Brad Falchuk, Jordana Brewster, Tobey Maguire, Rihanna, Mac Miller, Jennifer Hudson, Gwen Stefani, Usher, Jack Black, Seth Rogen, Robert Downey Jr., Halle Berry, Amanda Seyfried, Kate Beckinsale, Bono, Milla Jovovich, Alicia Keys.*"

An impressive client base. An A-celebrity portfolio. One would like to assume that the man and his entourage are proud of the illustrious circle of world stars who seek advice or training from him. It is all the more surprising that the entire client list quoted above has since been deleted from his Wikipedia entry and can only be accessed via www.archive.org.

The suspicion arises that corresponding interest groups are interested in downplaying his influence on the aforementioned superstars. Because Pasternak is by no means just a simple fitness trainer. This is shown by various short messages from Pasternak to Ye, which the artist recently published on his Twitter account, in other words, shortly before Pasternak's Wikipedia entry was edited. In one of these messages, Pasternak writes:

"*I'll help you in one way or another. First, you and I sit together for a nice, open conversation. But everything that is said is based on facts, not on some stupid shit that some friend told you or that you saw on Twitter. The second option is that I'll get you admitted once again, where they're going to treat the shit out of you—and you'll go back to zombieland forever. Play days with the children simply won't be the same after that.*"

In another message, the 45-year-old Pasternak threatened that he would ensure that Ye's children were taken away altogether if he "*wanted to bring the truth to light*." This aggressive style does not necessarily give the impression of a classic customer-supplier relationship. And there are reasons for this, as Pasternak's career implies.

Before his fabulous success as a Hollywood VIP coach, Pasternak worked for the Canadian Ministry of Defense.

More precisely, for the DRDC (Defense Research and Development Canada). There he worked at the Defense and Civil Institute for Environmental Medicine, a military research institution that deals with mind control and manipulation and has been collaborating closely with the US intelligence services since the 1950s, among other things with regard to the now widely known and illegal MK Ultra CIA's (Central Intelligence Agency) program, which the two

organizations even launched almost 70 years ago together with the British secret service MI6.

Pasternak was primarily responsible for human experiments with drugs. In interviews, he himself reports on how his department experimented with substances that were supposed to relieve soldiers of their need for sleep and keep them awake for days without any significant loss of concentration or performance. According to Pasternak, other experiments dealt with chemicals that trigger memory loss or change the personality of the test subject. Exactly the same symptoms Ye suffered from in 2016 when Pasternak had him admitted. This probably explains what the supposed fitness trainer means by the term "zombieland" he uses.

In a recent interview that lasts over three hours, Ye describes how the "superstar system" works. Authentic, emotional and uninhibited. He explains how they wanted to manipulate, shape and influence him for years. How he was forbidden to speak, how his family was destroyed. And how Pasternak took more ruthless measures when the increasingly self-confident artist nevertheless refused to engage in ongoing subversion.

You don't have to like Ye. You don't have to share his opinion. But you should be able to hear it.

Because even if his level of information leaves much to be desired, if his rhetoric often shines with simplicity and his ego stands in his way—there is a right to freedom of expression. And he is on the right track. Even if corruption, imperialism and monopolism cannot be limited to one faith or ethnicity, of course. Because the powerful have only one God: mammon.

In addition, one must pay respect to a person who stands by his convictions in times of incestuous art, docked debate spaces and discourse contamination. Who doesn't duck his head and subordinate himself to the collective for the sake of his career. Who refuses to submissively follow the instructions of his financiers, thereby putting his reputation, his business relationships, his wealth, his family and ultimately his life up for grabs in order to fight for open discourse, truth and peace.

When a fan asked him a few days ago how he felt about the situation, Ye replied:

"*They can't control me! They could control Lebron James, (...) they could control Jay-Z and Beyonce. They can't control me! Look, there's no name I don't mention. It's off. (...) There is God. That's the only one I serve. My mother is not here.*

My mother was sacrificed. Michael Jordan, what about him? His father. Right? Bill Cosby, his son? Right? Dr. Dre. His son? When you're in Hollywood, a lot of people are missing. It feels as if something like this happens very often to control, to traumatize. They want to monetize and traumatize."

Trauma factory Hollywood. Toxic—for artists and audiences alike. But Harley Pasternak is probably not the only so-called "*handler*" who takes care of keeping stubborn superstars in line. There are plenty of comparable processes. The illusory world of the celebrity Olympus requires strict control. This is the only way to maintain the painstakingly constructed parallel world behind the cinema screen—and to keep civilization in check.

Because without media indoctrination, the omnipresent screen, propaganda fanfare and the suggestive postulate of undiscovered

expanses, the archenemy, utopia or a better life, the world would be a different place. It is possible that Homo demens would concentrate on the essentials again without imposed distraction—and that has little to do with money, power and war.

“Filmmakers should keep in mind that all their films will be shown to them again on Judgement Day.” (Charlie Chaplin)

Normative Collectivism

About codes, cash, control and collectivism.

The QR code: since the Covid crisis at the latest, everyone has been familiar with it. Even the senior citizens. Many people associate the omnipresent, black-and-white square on documents, objects and displays with an uneasy feeling. With control, surveillance, with “track & trace.” Because when the various Covid regulations applied in many countries in the wake of the supposed pandemic, it was the code that decided on participation or non-participation in social life.

Restaurant, gym, retail, airplane, hotel—access only after presentation or after scanning the QR code. In the zero-Covid stronghold of the technocratic Middle Kingdom, the two-tone digital ankle bracelet has since determined the everyday life of an entire people. You can’t even get food there without the mark of oppression that is graphically reminiscent of a labyrinth.

In the meantime, however, the Chinese population also seems to be tired of the bullying of the all-powerful party. Protests have been escalating throughout the country for several days. Meanwhile, the government, undeterred, is building one huge Covid isolation camp after another.

The Chinese are rebelling against a system and its instrument of rule. Against the digital brand that makes the herd manageable.

Cattle usually wear it on their buttocks. *Homo sapiens* on the smartphone.

Let us recall its predecessor, the barcode, developed in 1949 by the United States inventors Norman Woodland and Bernard Silver. Quite a few people considered it, too, to be the "mark of the beast," a symbol of that dark, eschatological power that, towards the end of time, seeks to impose its will driven by evil forces on all Earth's inhabitants.

Mystically charged conspiracy theories have always surrounded the topic. That said, it is relatively easy to verify that the number sequence "666," which is significant in occultism, cannot be part of every barcode label, as is often postulated. Nevertheless, the rumor persists. Even the Reuters news agency reported in 2007 how hundreds of God-fearing people in Russia rejected new ID cards because they allegedly contained the satanic digits.

But even without delving into mysticism, numerology and occult spheres, a closer look at the optoelectronic registration machinery of our time shows that the associated increase in efficiency and the gain in convenience certainly has its price. Even if supposed innovations such as the QR-bill, which is already standard in the Swiss financial industry, initially promise simplification.

The QR code was developed in 1994 by the Japanese company Denso, a spin-off of the Toyota Group that has been operating independently since 1949. The maximum information content of such a Quick Response Code is 23,648 bits. This corresponds to 7089 decimal digits, 4,296 alphanumeric characters or 1817 Chinese characters. In addition, the cryptic-looking codes have a high tolerance for errors.

This means that scanners can still read it, even if up to 30 percent of the information is no longer available. This makes the QR code the perfect basis for digital identification systems (eID) and wallets.

It is not for nothing that projects such as ID2020 by GAVI, Microsoft, Bill Gates and the Rockefeller Foundation or The Commons Project, founded by the WEF in 2019 with money from the Rockefeller Foundation, are based on this development.

The use of the QR code is royalty-free and free of charge. The specifications were disclosed by Denso and have since been managed by the International Organization for Standardization (ISO), which was founded in London in 1946 and has been based in Geneva (Switzerland) since 1949. The ISO is a successor organization to the ISA (International Federation of the National Standardizing Associations), which was founded in 1926 and existed until 1942 and took care of the international standardization of non-electronic technologies.

Even earlier, in 1904, the foundation stone for the International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) was laid in St. Louis (USA), but since 1948 it has also resided in Geneva and is working on global synergies between electronics and electrical engineering. Since the beginning of the twentieth century, international standardization efforts have been launched, organized and financed primarily by large-scale industry. Names such as Siemens, Standard Oil (Rockefeller), J.P. Morgan or Harvard University are repeatedly encountered in the corresponding documents.

A working paper of the MIT Sloan School of Management from January 2007, which deals with the founding of the ISO, states in this regard:

"Even if inconspicuously, setting standards has been part of the be-all-and-end-all of the globalization of industrial capitalism since its beginnings and ensures that everything that has to fit together fits together. From product to product, from industry to industry and from country to country. (...)
Over the past two decades, voluntary standardization processes, invented at the turn of the century by engineers working on national and international technical bodies, have been increasingly applied to fields that have little to do with the assembly of a mechanical part, such as work processes (ISO 9000), pollution (ISO 14,000) and human rights (SA 8000, ISO 26000).
This rapidly growing scope, plus the high visibility of standards in networked areas such as telecommunications, has led to new interest in standard-setting practices."

It is about the "*measurement of the world*," but produces less pleasing moments than reading the eponymous novel by Daniel Kehlmann. As the frequent traveler can easily see in everyday life, an entire century of standardization and harmonization has not culminated in the existence of the same electrical sockets worldwide, for example. Something that would be practical, of course. However, it is above all international corporate structures, payment systems, interbank processes, transport routes, secret services, the military and data collection points that have grown together. As inconspicuous and bureaucratic as the tasks of non-governmental organizations such as ISA, ISO or IEC may seem, their efforts and results are fundamental for a supranationally operating technocracy.

It should also be noted that the standardization of the world—like so many globalization processes—originated in the United Kingdom at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century. It took place in circles of Anglo-Saxon high finance

including Cecil Rhodes, Alfred Milner, Montagu Norman, the Bank of England, the Fabian Society or the British royal family, all of whom aspired for a world government under British aegis and a resurrection of the "Empire," as countless original documents from this period prove.

Today, the globalization of the banking and corporate oligarchy has reached a level that makes the nation-state de facto obsolete.

The network of global governance directs and determines international agreements, interwoven partnerships and transatlantic regulations that elude any democratic influence. The next stage on the way to the Orwellian surveillance state is likely to be the introduction of central bank digital currencies. And for this too—in addition to disruption, which makes change appear without alternative—standardization processes are necessary. Especially for the conversion of national currencies in international payment transactions and interbank business.

This is shown by the pilot projects of the Bank for International Settlements (BIS), established in 1930, the central bank of central banks based in Basel, which initially functioned as a reparations bank after the First World War and distributed German annuities to the various creditors. Today, the BIS is a private company in extraterritorial territory, whose employees enjoy diplomatic immunity.

The BIS was co-founded by Hjalmar Schacht, former NSDAP member, president of the Reichsbank and Reich Minister of Economics under Hitler. Schacht got off surprisingly lightly at the Nuremberg Trials, despite his exposed position in the Third Reich, and founded the Deutsche Außenhandelsbank Schacht und Co. as early as 1953. He then worked successfully internationally

as a financial consultant and published books. In the 1960s, he became a member of the right-wing extremist Gesellschaft für freie Publizistik.

And as late as 1967, Schacht gave an economic policy presentation at the party congress of the nationalist Aktionsgemeinschaft Unabhängiger Deutscher (AUD), a wild gathering place for nationalists, some of whom distanced themselves from the Nazi regime, and ex-Nazis such as the former Reichsleiter of the Hitler Youth, Wolf Schenke. Schacht died in Munich in 1970. His daughter, Cordula Schacht, is still the official executor of Joseph Goebbels' estate.

The AUD was later absorbed into the Greens—which fits the background of the Green Party founder Baldur Springmann, who died in 2003. Springmann was a member of the NSDAP, SA and SS and a "*staunch Nazi*," according to an article in the *Hamburger Abendblatt* from April 2020.

Extremist ideologies have apparently always been a core element of the power-green DNA—no matter what political spectrum they originate from. Perhaps for this reason, the party functionaries of postmodernism have no qualms about implementing a new totalitarian model of rule and the new edition of the Cultural Revolution. This would explain why the red-green federal government acts as a compliant vassal of the digital-financial complex, NATO hegemony and globalist philanthropy, and why "*the best Germany of all time*" is degenerating into the European image of China.

"*It is possible to control and discipline individual societies over a certain period of time, but not the whole world all the time*." (Report: *Scenarios for the Future of Technology and International Development*, Rockefeller Foundation 2010, Lock Step, p. 20)

The 9/11 event provided justification for the massive expansion of the surveillance state. The financial crisis of 2008 finally handed over the now even more hopelessly over-indebted nation states to the supranational banking cartel. The deliberately amplified pandemic provided reasons to expand the fight against terrorism into a biosecurity doctrine and to finally undermine the autonomy of the individual. And either war, a financial crash or the cyber pandemic promised by the World Economic Forum (WEF) will have to serve as a pretext for the introduction of the new digital currency.

The universal basic income that creates dependence—as a harbinger of the paternalistic collective state—is already being prepared.

And in the United States, too, people are working feverishly on the final tool of administrative oppression, the digital dollar. On November 15, 2022, the Innovation Center of the New York Federal Reserve Bank announced that it would start a twelve-week test run for central bank digital money—together with the most important major banks and financial institutions in the country: Citi, HSBC, SWIFT, Mastercard, Wells Fargo, et cetera. Edward Snowden, the NSA/CIA whistleblower, commented on the message on Twitter succinctly with the words: "*It's beginning*."

It is probably once again a coincidence that the spectacular bankruptcy of the crypto platform FTX, a nebulous Ponzi scheme disguised as a DeFi (decentralized finance) and investment company yet designed to erode trust in the unregulated crypto market—should collapse precisely during this period—and that the state digital money project, which peddles promises of security, appears in a better light as a result.

The FTX scam, which began surprisingly punctually with Joe Biden's presidency, then predictably led to immediate calls for a significant increase in regulation of the crypto market on the part of the United States Congress. In this way, the digital dollar is gaining sympathy among the population. Although it only has disadvantages for the average citizen. Problem, reaction, solution. Hegelian Dialectics.

Simple and effective in terms of social engineering. Unfortunately, central bank currencies are like Bitcoin—hardly anyone has dealt with the details. Most anti-government minds associate CBDCs (central bank digital currencies) with something negative, because they are issued and managed by central banks. Bitcoin and other cryptocurrencies, on the other hand, are considered decentralized, hip and a central tool of libertarianism. Far from it.

Firstly, Bitcoin and co. are neither anonymous nor secure nor the epitome of the decentralized; indeed, they are more of a psyop. Secondly, there are dozens of different forms of central bank currencies. And not all of them lead directly to the financial bondage that is actually to be expected in the end. For example, the United States company Ripple, which developed and launched the popular cryptocurrency XRP, is cooperating with the European Central Bank to advance the digital euro. At the same time, it is developing a cross-platform PayID. Technocracy with a cool blockchain start-up image, in other words. On the other hand, there are certainly CBDC concepts that pursue practicable approaches and enable anonymous peer-2-peer payments, in other words, the direct transfer of value between two non-commercial market participants. In addition, there is non-consensus in the banking sector on whether or not to introduce central bank digital currencies—because commercial and private banks see

themselves threatened by the monetary paradigm shift in their core business and fear disappearing into insignificance.

So you have to deal with the matter in more detail in order to be able to assess the situation correctly, and you have to understand the difference between "wholesale CBDC" and "retail CBDC." Precision is key for the public discussion on the topic. Because if critical circles only speak indiscriminately of the one "evil central bank currency that will enslave us all," this will not be to their advantage in the long term. For example, if the first digital currency to be introduced was to be less totalitarian than predicted, this would unnecessarily prove the well-meaning admonishers wrong. Even if they are right in the end—because if humanity does not defend itself peacefully, the current course will lead to a digital gulag.

In Australia, critics of Covid measures were visited by the local police as early as October 2021 when they published anti-government demonstrations on Facebook, meaning the simple "sharing" of Facebook events. Not wild activism. Shortly after the fateful click, the officers stood at the front door with a paper printout of the post in question, taking many a delinquent to the station for interrogation.

In Canada, in February 2022, the government froze the bank accounts of thousands of demonstrators, namely truck drivers, who peacefully positioned themselves against Covid measures or confiscated their trucks.

This deep red line of state encroachment has now also been crossed by Brazil's new government, where people who publicly doubted the legality of the removal of previous President Jair Bolsonaro from office were unceremoniously blocked from accessing

their bank accounts. To date, "only" non-conformists have been blocked from their Twitter, Facebook or YouTube accounts, PayPal or bank accounts. At some point, however, these processes will affect every citizen. Even those gullible people who eagerly align themselves with whatever position is touted to be the acceptable norm at the moment. At the latest when it is no longer just about Covid but about the individual carbon footprint will they realize that freedom is never simply granted to us but always something we have to fight for.

In light of the circumstances that have been illuminated so far, it is more than worrying that the heads of state and government of the G20 recently announced that they want to make digital health passports a prerequisite for international travel in the future. To the uniform, global standard. In the Bali Declaration of the G20 Conference of November 15 and 16, 2022, this encroachment on fundamental rights of the population is euphemistically marketed under the noble goal of "*safe global mobility*."

Indonesia's Minister of Health, Budi Gunadi Sadikin, explains exactly what is meant by the feel-good phrases:

"*Let's introduce a digital health certificate, recognized by the WHO. If they have been fully vaccinated or tested, they can travel. (...) We will propose this at the next World Health Assembly in Geneva as a reform of the International Health Regulations.*"

It doesn't take too much imagination to imagine how quickly a globally standardized health passport can become a convenient smartphone app that also includes the electronic ID card and is linked to social media accounts as well as one's own CBDC central bank account. It takes even less imagination to imagine the degree of direct influence that the controllers of these integrated

applications will have over the lives of individuals—and how unscrupulously they will exercise this control to maintain their own power.

Thus, the inconspicuous QR code imperceptibly advances to become a ticket to totalitarianism. An entrance ticket to the algorithmic ghetto of tomorrow's brave new world order. How grotesque this is is shown by an incident from November 16, 2022, which is not without a certain irony. On the day in question, a video of that year's World Government Summit made the rounds on the internet. Or rather: the reaction of the video platform YouTube to the corresponding excerpt. While the World Government Summit, which has been taking place in Dubai since 2013, is a real event and has an official website along with a detailed Wikipedia entry, YouTube marked an official, unadulterated recording of the panel discussion on the topic "Are we ready for a new world order?," which is also published on the summit's own YouTube channel, with the automatic and censorial note: "*The New World Order is a conspiracy theory that assumes a secretly emerging, totalitarian world government.*"

Cacophony of Corporatism

An autumnal inventory of the irritating status quo.
An overall view, so to speak. Written in October 2022 for the winter issue of *TUMULT* magazine, the quarterly journal for consensus disruption.

A rough tone—that is the soundtrack of the *Zeitenwende*. A gloomy dissonance that looms over the country like a standing wave. Over the entire civilization. An arrangement of destructive interference frequencies that carries from edited debate spaces to the last corners of the ailing civil society sounding board in order to maltreat the foundations of humanism, enlightenment and sovereign autonomy.

Concerted and amplified disruptions, whose normative transformation processes no one has been able to escape since the proclamation of the supposed pandemic of the century.

Not that this dissonance, which can be associated with an enervating tinnitus, this cacophony of apocalyptic arias is a novelty—because the crescendo can be reconstructed over decades if one follows the trail of money—but many only became aware of it with the establishment of the encroaching Covid infection regime in March 2020. When the deafening silence of justice and the Fourth Estate could no longer be ignored and tyranny had arrived home.

"*No other department stands for the new socio-political sound of the coalition government as much as the Ministry of Justice," Süddeutsche Zeitung* announced on July 18, 2022. And this assessment is correct. Because rarely has democracy been more waste, the judiciary more dysfunctional and the administrative tenor more totalitarian than it is now.

The final chord of casino capitalism in the post-truth of the media age merges into a chaotic canon of crises intoned by corrupt profiteers of a financial system that was already doomed to immanent collapse in 2008. Their puppets in the state apparatus obediently join in. Because their share capital—the trust values—was also largely gambled away. So the siren song of eternal growth now dies away in the freezing cold of a dark German "winter of rage."

The moral and ethical paradigm shifts of the past two and a half years, the equalization of language, logic, and coherence, the erosion of a Europe of friendly peoples, and the creative destruction of supply chains have resulted in the transition from a constitutionally sovereign state and unilateral Pax Americana to a rules-based international order.

Rhythmically accentuated by propaganda trumpets, conformist art and intellectual incest, an emaciated model of rule entreats, in an increasingly hectic rhythm, the postulated result of its social Darwinist metamorphosis, disguised as progress—the global governance of public-private partnerships. In the modus operandi of the temporary-permanent state of emergency, the paternalistic regulatory state sets the stage for the Orwellian dystopia of a neo-feudalism euphemistically glorified as the Fourth Industrial Revolution.

With symbolic politics and infantilizing imagery, supranational corporatism is vying for the remaining attention of the masses sedated by the media. Meanwhile, a monopolized platform economy complements the surveillance state and realizes the transparent citizen.

Big tech consortia coordinate the discourse contamination elegantly outsourced by Washington, London and the European Commission.

Legitimized by perfidious newspeak and unwieldy legislature such as the Network Enforcement Act, they implement the algorithmic censorship of heretics and non-conformists, namely those who have the audacity to not accommodate prefabricated uniform opinions. At the same time, the digital book burning is breaking through.

Under the flimsy pretext of online security, the ministries of truth of a dogmatic, dark green apocalyptic sect are setting the Alexandrian library of our time on fire—the free internet.

Heterodox theses are eradicated on a large scale by cancel culture. With the backing of the United Nations (UN), which officially declared war on "conspiracy theories" in August 2022.

Because in the "new normal," freedom of expression stands for microaggression, and war for peace. Shadily financed think tanks, foundations and an armada of NGOs "nudge" doomsday anthems, elitist narratives, stressors or one-dimensional worldviews into the minds of human capital. In this way, they channel the amplitudes of instrumentalized emotion, stimulated by imposed transformation processes, into increasingly fragmented feedback bubbles. Divide et impera, in the tradition of the ancien régime.

Echo chambers become spaces of fear. Hegelian dialectics and social engineering are intended to evoke consensus. Or fear.

See the Federal Ministry of the Interior's "Panic Paper" of March 2020—a guide to psychological warfare written by government advisors. The preferred and targeted state of mind of society as a whole is submissiveness. Because resistance makes change without alternative more expensive.

Nevertheless, in the prosperity-deprived West, in addition to social strife, even civil war now seems to be moving into the realm of possibility. The lynch mob is no longer completely absurd.

Nick Hanauer, co-founder of Amazon, predicted as early as 2014 in an open letter to his super-rich friends and billionaire colleagues in the United States: "*Do you know what I see? I see pitchforks.*"

Looking at the actions of the monocausally arguing German government in the dawning autumn of 2022, the question arises as to whether the lobbyists and apparatchiks of the globalist pacesetters are not literally provoking unrest.

> **"All tyrants rule with deceit and violence. But when the fraud is exposed, they have to rely entirely on force." (George Orwell)**

In neighboring countries, there is already clear resistance to the repressive democracy of a corrupt political class. Economic hardship does the rest to drive demonstrators onto the streets. And the strategy of creating new "*order out of chaos*" is by no means new. This is evidenced by two world wars financed by Anglo-American capital. Without these battles for the fairy tale of the "free world," neither performative geopolitics nor the

current financial system would be under the aegis of the United States hegemon.

The World Economic Forum (WEF), which was initiated in 1971 by war criminal Henry Kissinger and has since been headed by Klaus Schwab, the son of a wealthy Nazi collaborator, tries to communicate the transformative agenda of the upper class in a positive way and serves as a front organization and for the promotion of young talent.

With an alumni network of 3,800 Young Global Leaders, the WEF—as Schwab proudly elaborates—"penetrates" not only corporations, media and NGOs but in the meantime also cabinets so effectively that its illegally preaching staff is able to orchestrate and promote the controversial programs of oligarchs acting in an organized criminal manner on a global scale.

Yes, we are at war. It is the asymmetrical war against ourselves. It is conducted medically, mentally and through the media.

In the background, countless publicity-shy organizations such as the Wellcome Trust are working not against external enemies but against their own populations—on "Trojan Horse Civilian Systems," as Dennis Bushnell, NASA's chief scientist since the Gemini programs, calls it. In other words: weapons systems, including biological ones, which, disguised as civilian projects, are used against civilians. His disturbing 131-slide presentation called "Future Strategic Issues/Future Warfare, Circa 2025" from 2001 shows why the positive image of the United States space agency is deceptive.

NASA invests 80 percent of its budget in military projects, not in the exploration of the undiscovered expanses of space, and two

decades ago accurately predicted a quantum leap in biological warfare against the "enemy within" in 2020—the beginning of the era of invasive mRNA and nanotechnology, bio-hacking and human genetics.

Benito Mussolini, "Duce" of Italy from 1922 to 1943, remarked at the time: "*Fascism should be called corporatism because it is the perfect fusion of the power of government and corporations*." Looking at the status quo, it should be indisputable that the organization, participation and communication structures of today's system come frighteningly close to the ideal of the former Italian dictator. The fusion of the military-industrial complex controlled by the financial sector with the digital economy makes it possible.

The fact that the superclass has long since abdicated categories such as participation, the nation state or human rights—in addition to supporting the warmongering and intelligence activities of the hegemonic powers—is illustrated by a study by ETH Zurich from 2011 entitled "The Network of Global Corporate Control." The topography of international governance visualized by the researchers illustrates the striking accumulation of capital on the planet. The study not only sheds light on the direct influence of investments on markets and politics but also analyzes indirect influence across multiple levels of participation for the first time.

Data from 43,000 companies were evaluated. As a result, even at that time, only 147 entities controlled about 40 percent of all assets of transnational corporations. But every crisis accelerates the consolidation of the markets.

The richest one percent of humanity currently owns as much as the poorer 50 percent. A mere 0.1 percent of the world's population owns 81 percent of the world's wealth. This illustrious

top of the food chain prefers to meet behind closed doors. At meetings of the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), Chatham House, Atlantik-Brücke, the Bilderberg Conferences, the Trilateral Commission or at the Bohemian Grove in the redwood forests of California—to name just a few. No one who has serious power today is not accredited to one of the numerous "invite-only clubs."

"The illegal we do immediately. The unconstitutional takes a little longer." (Henry Kissinger)

The idea of the common good was eliminated and unscrupulously shelved. This has hardly ever been more obvious. Profits are privatized, losses are socialized. Shamelessly. Price spiral, inflation growth—and a natural gas levy.

As luck would have it, the company Uniper, based in Düsseldorf, initially benefited from the financial injection for the energy industry.

It was 56 percent owned by the Finnish energy company Fortum, which is paying out considerable bonuses in the current fiscal year.

WEF favorite Philipp Rösler, former FDP federal chairman and vice-chancellor, sits on its supervisory board. Analogous to the Scholz case—with CumEx, WireCard, emetic torture and intensive care bed fraud—an example of the obscene audacity of the "powerful."

This manifests itself vividly in the handling of the neoliberal counter-revolution launched in the 1970s, a fiscal raid initiated by waves of privatization, which is currently culminating in the final and lethal wave of expropriation. In the course of a home-made economic crisis, this first ruins private households, then

redistributes the remaining wealth upwards, and then the handing over to natural resources by means of a green economy and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) to international big business. After all, the last "asset," the last asset class that still needs to be capitalized after a hostile takeover of private assets, is nature.

This coup d'état is flanked by the restoration of power by a technocratic-fascistic interpretive elite that spares neither costs nor efforts to maintain air sovereignty over the discourse corridors. Omnipresent "telescreens" (G. Orwell) and the covert consolidation of media power in the mainstream de facto enable the information supply to be brought into line. Only six companies control 90 percent of the media in the United States. Only four press agencies are responsible for the content of 90 percent of all newspapers worldwide.

In 2019, a study by Swiss Policy Research entitled "The Propaganda Multiple: How Global News Agencies and Western Media Report on Geopolitics" documented the frightening power agglomeration of local opinion makers.

Edward Bernays, nephew of Sigmund Freud and father of professional propaganda, could hardly have calibrated the digitized manipulation machinery of the "Build Back Better" campaign better.

In this way, even ideas of reproductive medicine that were thought to have been forgotten are experiencing a revival under new labels. What is now touted as bioethics in magazines such as the *Journal of Biosocial Science*, which was called *The Eugenics Review* until 1969, paraphrases theses from dark times before the Nuremberg Code. At the beginning of the twentieth century and well into the 1960s, these were quite socially acceptable,

as the Eugenics Archive of Canada, which was run at some expense, illustrates.

Whether George Bernard Shaw, Henry Ford, Alexander Graham Bell, Sir Francis Galton, H.G. Wells or William Henry Gates, the late father of Bill Gates, they all cultivated visions of master races and inferior life, reasoned about genetic optimization of breeding, and were euphoric eugenicists and/or anti-Semites.

Interestingly, Gates sat for many years on the board of the Planned Parenthood Federation, a successor organization to the American Birth Control League, founded in 1916 by Margaret Sanger, which was committed to the mandatory sterilization of Native Americans, the disabled, the poor or criminals. Perhaps that's why his son talks about depopulation programs at every opportunity. Just like Julian Huxley, brother of the *Brave New World* author Aldous Huxley, who was president of the British Eugenics Society from 1959 to 1962, co-founded the World Wildlife Fund in 1961 and served as the first director of UNESCO. In the constituent pamphlet of the globalist organization entitled "UNESCO—Its Purpose and Philosophy" in 1946, he insinuates (p. 20, ff):

"*So while radical eugenic policies will be politically and psychologically impossible for many years to come, it will be important for UNESCO to ensure that the eugenic problem is studied with the utmost care and that the public is informed about the problems so that much that is now unthinkable can at least become conceivable.*"

It is significant in this context that the same Wall Street magnates who financed the fascism that took a stranglehold on Europe in the 1930s also conspired in the United States to install a fascist dictatorship. In the end, however, democratic forces prevailed

in 1933. The coup d'état, financed from New York, was averted. Franklin D. Roosevelt was sworn in as president.

It was thanks to his New Deal that Anglo-American high finance was not the driving force in the country for a few years of recent US history. Nazi Germany, meanwhile, was inspired by the sterilization programs, racial laws and concentration camps of the United States.

Adolf Hitler sent fan mail to American eugenicists, to whom Josef Mengele reported on his despicable human experiments. *Mein Kampf* is largely an adaptation of Henry Ford's anti-Semitic concoction *The International Jew*. Even the Hitler salute is by no means a creation of the German dictator, but comes from the United States and is called "Bellamy Salute," after the socialist Francis Bellamy, and was demonstrated in American schools until December 22, 1942 as an official oath of allegiance to the United States flag. Then the fascist gesture was replaced. The forced sterilization of indigenous peoples, on the other hand, was given less attention and remained common practice until the 1970s.

Even now, it is once again a perverted idea of health "protection," namely, the ideal of the genetically optimized body of the people, which serves as a lever to justify eugenic-shaped will-o'-the-wisps. The Covid biosecurity doctrine represents a transparent continuation of the "War on Terror" based on lies.

It allows those at the top to bring the surveillance state to a new level. In addition, the invasive agenda offers an opportunity to sensitize society to transhumanism and the singularity longed for by Silicon Valley grandees such as Ray Kurzweil or Eric Schmidt. Elon Musk, the liberal-looking "bad boy" of billionaires, takes the same line with his Neuralink brain implants.

The metaverse joint ventures of WEF and Facebook are another symptom of technocratic dehumanization. The next evolutionary stage is the cyborg. People are demoted to a disoriented mass of available assets. To products. According to Yuval Noah Harari, pioneer of transhumanism and dataism at the WEF, this is precisely where the future of the unemployed, immobile, impoverished and useless *Homo sapiens*—Homo demens—lies, in "*a mix of computer games and drugs*." In virtual reality. Or alternatively, from a certain age, in euthanasia. For the greater good. The biofascism of the "new normal" does not execute its opponents. It isolates, defames and assimilates, à la "Borg."

Covid, war, climate change and poverty already have explosive power. But as an additional divisive force, the constantly more morally free "Woko Haram" also whips a reinterpretation of the Cultural Revolution through the republic, which is acutely threatened by deindustrialization. Extreme political correctness and the "gender star" (a linguistic tool used in German to create gender-inclusive language by inserting an asterisk) instead of prosperity.

The goal is to maintain the illusion that the manifold disagreements of these days are organically grown conflicts of specific milieus, political currents or diametrically opposed catalogues of values. About culture and class struggle. And although traditional political spectrums are of no relevance to the current geopolitical turbulences or the construct of domination of the emerging, multipolar world order, public discourse stoically revolves around this fixed point. To this is added that the absolutism of deconstructivist postmodernism knows no idol and does not believe in party membership. It is a faceless empire. A bureaucratic juggernaut that delegates responsibilities until they've disintegrated in their entirety. This fatal mélange of technocracy and corporatism knows neither left nor right—only above and below.

This is illustrated by the Ukraine conflict, in which the left-wing West supports a corrupt regime infiltrated by the Azov Battalion and other Nazi groups. It is a proxy war led by the United States, which, by means of regime change vehicles such as the National Endowment for Democracy (NED) or George Soros' Open Society Foundation (OSF), induced a European variant of perma-conflicts of the Arab world into the "Euromaidan" in order to destabilize arch-enemy Russia. Exactly as proposed by the United States think tank RAND Corporation in the 354-page strategy paper with the telling title "Extending Russia: Competing from Advantageous Ground" from 2019. For example, three geopolitical power blocs are currently fighting for leadership in the new multilateral world, although each of them is firmly in line with the authoritarian Agenda 2030 when it comes to technocracy. And the real victim of the frictional heat is—as always—the peace-loving but divided population.

It is no coincidence that a panopticon of elitists—including Angela Merkel, Olaf Scholz, Ursula von der Leyen, Donald Trump, the demented Joe Biden, Justin Trudeau, Prince Charles or Boris Johnson—described Covid-19 as a "*unique*" to "*historic opportunity*" that "should be *seized*." Because the lockdown regime favored the largest redistribution of wealth in history. The balance sheet values of capital collection agencies such as Blackrock, Vanguard or State Street bear witness to the fact that Covid was tantamount to a steroid for the corporate oligarchy. Companies such as Alphabet (Google), Amazon, Microsoft and Meta (Facebook) were the biggest beneficiaries, along with Pfizer's mRNA pusher columns or the DARPA spin-off Moderna. While the average citizen thought he was in the middle of a traumatic disaster. The standard question of criminology—cui bono?—should therefore be clarified. This is how corporatism works.

"*We decide something, then put it in the room and wait for some time to see what happens. If there is no big outcry and no riots, because most people don't even understand what has been decided, then we continue. Step by step, until there is no turning back.*" (Jean-Claude Juncker, *SPIEGEL*, December 27, 1999)

The nature of the respective crisis defines which industry absorbs the constantly dwindling national wealth in direct succession. Mussolini would be proud of the Central Committees in Brussels, London and Washington.

The rendezvous of corrupt incompetence and organized crime in Berlin is also likely to delight the former ruler of Italy. A chancellor who is adorned with a colorful bouquet of corruption scandals disavows the sovereign in existential distress with perseverance slogans and feel-good platitudes. Closely followed by plagiarist and language acrobat Annalena Baerbock, who "*doesn't care what her voters think*." Not to mention Lauterbach and Buschmann. But all the shitstorms, talk show trench warfare, straw man arguments and smokescreens are occupational therapy. Diversion.

Because the ugly facts have been on the table for a long time. And while the truth may not always be popular, it will prevail in the long run. In view of the increasing suffering, it is difficult to bear that this has not already taken place. Because of the ubiquitous dilettantism, one forgets everywhere that this staged, clumsy farce—this simulation of democracy—is about the real lives of gullible radio consumers and "smombies," and not the "scripted reality" or a miserably cast *Truman Show*. It all seems and sounds surreal. Like a cult. After mass hypnosis. You really have to want to believe it.

Inevitably, the question arises as to how such grotesque conditions could be cemented and why nothing has changed over generations.

When should the many have intervened to put a stop to today's technocratic neo-feudalism dictated by the few? Some 500 years BC, when Solon reformed Attic democracy to make representative rule socially acceptable? Although even in ancient Greece this was little more than a cost-benefit analysis of the Athenian elites, who wanted to protect their status and power from impending revolutions. Or a few centuries later, to break the dominance of clergy, high nobility, hereditary monarchy and colonialism?

Or in the 17th century, when the British royal family granted special rights to rich merchants in order to form the British East India Company, which was henceforth allowed to enact corporate laws, control the Indian and Pacific Oceans and brutally enforce Anglo-Saxon economic imperialism?

Or better yet, in the middle of the 18th century, when banking dynasties of unprecedented influence and wealth arose in Europe, which, out of greed for profit and to the present day, play off politics, economy and society against each other, which they proudly document in family archives, as for example with regard to the Battle of Waterloo or the significant Balfour Declaration?

Should Cecil Rhodes have been stopped, the racist colonialist, most powerful man of his time and founder of De Beers, to whom the British colonies "Rhodesia" owed their names? After all, his plans for the establishment of an Anglo-American-dominated world order via "round table" groups and a Ponzi central bank scheme, which are handed down in his will, seem to have borne fruit so far. The renowned historian Caroll Quigley, who taught as a professor at the elite universities of Harvard and Princeton, wrote about these mafia-like activities in his works *Tragedy and Hope* and *The Anglo-American Establishment:*

"*This junta took control of the political, financial and cultural life of America in the first two decades of the twentieth century*. (…) *This system was to be controlled in a feudal way by the central banks of the world, which acted together* (…). *The top of the system was to be the Bank for International Settlements in Basel, a private bank owned and controlled by the world's central banks, which are themselves private companies*. (…) *On this originally financial basis* (…) *In the twentieth century, a power structure emerged between London and New York that penetrated deeply into university life, the press and the practice of foreign policy*."

Could the cognitive devolution, the invisible prison that the habitat of *Homo sapiens* has since become, have been counteracted in 1919, when Howard Scott founded the Technocracy movement in New York, which set out to control the planet through the energy consumption of all its systems—which, according to the ideology of the technocrats, also includes humans? After all, this is the core goal of the climate apocalypticists, who have been ammunitioned by the Club of Rome since 1972, and who these days presume to want to restrict the individual mobility of humanity via carbon tracking.

Perhaps Huxley's *Brave New World* was already a de facto reality when Richard Nixon visited Mao Zedong in 1972, whose rise to become the "*Outstanding Leader*" was primarily financed by the United States elite Yale University—and whom the mill churning out elites still refers to as an "alumnus" in the in-house newspaper *Yale Daily News*.

Because what Nixon and Kissinger offered the mass murderer was not an economic "*opening to the West*" but the technocratic model of rule. Even before the conclusion of the first trade agreement with Beijing, US companies began to build the corresponding

infrastructure in the Middle Kingdom to make China a pilot project for the transparent society of the future.

"*Inventions for people are suppressed, inventions against them are promoted,*" Berthold Brecht once pointed out. In 1998, the *Washington Post* picked up on the topic when it became known that US companies were illegally transferring secret space technology to the People's Republic. The following year, the US Department of Commerce provided a detailed study of the security risks of clandestine technology transfers, as well as the astronomical sums that US corporations and international oligarchy shifted to China.

The spearhead of these activities was the Rockefeller dynasty, which was also in charge of the founding of the United Nations (UN), the World Health Organization (WHO) and the CFR. Even the prime property on New York's East River, on which the UN headquarters building stands today, was a "donation" from the banking family. The Rockefeller empire stretched its tentacles far ahead of all political envoys in the direction of China. The German-born family, whose roots date back to 1590, has been conspicuously intensively committed to the "*democratic dictatorship of the people*" since the beginning of the twentieth century.

This is proven by archives of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund. As early as 1917, the industrial magnate John D. Rockefeller, who of course also had the best connections to Yale, founded a school in China. He first made a name for himself in the world's third-largest country at the exact time when the Communist Party was founded. Accordingly, the impeccable scientific publication *The Lancet* states in an article of May 11, 2013 that no one has had more influence in the field of "global health" in the past 100 years than the Rockefeller Foundation. The same applies to many industries.

The archive of the discreetly operating foundation, which dates back to 1910, shows the enormous spheres of influence it opened up within a century.

> **"Some believe that we are part of a secret alliance that works against the best interests of the United States; they characterize my family and me as internationalists and claim that we have conspired with others worldwide to establish a globally integrated, political-economic structure (...). If that's the charge, I'll plead guilty, and I'm proud of it." (David Rockefeller, Memoirs, 2002)**

Should one have simply prevented excessive wealth? Or might it have still been possible to thwart the illiberal present in 1930, when the Bank for International Settlements (BIS), which resides in Basel on an extraterritorial territory, was founded by a cross-generational network of international high finance? Or in 1944, when the same clique in Bretton Woods devised the current fiat financial system, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank emerged and unleashed "economic hit men" set out to subjugate the world monetarily?

Since then, the international banking cartel has unequivocally demonstrated the deterministic agenda items it pursues. The fact that little will change in this course—au contraire—is suggested by various activities of the BIS. For example, Project Helvetia, a "proof of concept" in the field of central bank digital currency (CBDC). Or Project Viridis, a platform for climate-related risk management that tax authorities are to use in the future.

Be that as it may. So far, no one has opposed the aforementioned developments with sufficient force. So the human family probably has the governments it deserves, as Joseph de Maistre put

it. Quod erat demonstrandum. What used to be called clergy, nobility, aristocracy or feudal system still exists. In the form of capital accumulation, non-transparent participation structures, technocracy and corporatist global governance. Dressed in philanthropic camouflage.

Modern pseudo-democracy is a Trojan horse. A Potemkin village. Fantasy—like the vision of a free, dignified life in smart cities, where predictive software finally liberates homo dementia from the burden of informed decision-making. Yes, the opponent of liberally organized civil societies, known as the deep state, may currently be the foremost actor, the Beelzebub, whereas bureaucrats, the judiciary and the executive branch are its unscrupulous henchmen, and the World Economic Forum its PR and project management department.

But there is every reason to believe that long-term planning, the roadmap of geopolitical tyranny, is still defined by circles that do not care about political currents. By circles that don't think in terms of electoral cycles.

In view of these circumstances, the desire for freedom and actionism are fruitless if supranational, technocratic corporatism is to be stopped by means of representative democracy at the national level. No parliament, no party and no opposition movement will significantly change the system with tools provided by it. If democratic processes or elections could do that, they would be banned.

Thus, the hypothesis that "*history teaches people that history teaches people nothing*" (M. Gandhi) is substantiated. They allow themselves to be duped. Although the seizure of power by fascist triumvirates in Europe, the historical correlate to the present,

only happened less than a century ago, nonchalant historical oblivion is rampant. "*Reason is the ability to think objectively*," Erich Fromm noted—but many fellow human beings seem to have given up on that. This makes it all the more urgent to find out how the "spiritus liber" can wriggle out of the clutches of a model of domination when it can no longer be escaped by simply crossing a national border, when freedom no longer simply waits behind a wall in the West.

When collectivism usurps the individual, ideology eliminates rationality, double standards replace ethos and humanism is assassinated by do-gooders, new solutions and forms of organization are needed. You don't have to escape the system spatially, but mentally—by boycotting predictive thought patterns and life plans. By following irrefutable convictions, instead of cognitive dissonances in the intellectual basement. By living digital abolitionism. Detox—not revisionism. As a gambler of one's own plot. "*One should not want to foresee the future, but make it possible*," demanded Antoine de Saint-Exupery.

This was to be the focus of the resistance in the grip of the *Zeitenwende*—on the establishment of alternatives to fiat money, fake democracy, socialism, communism or fascism. Because as a result, all these concepts stand for one and the same thing: tyranny.

They are "*equal brothers with unequal caps*," Hannah Arendt stated. Wherever the journey takes us—in the direction of grassroots democracy based on the Swiss model, in a society governed by private law, a lean minimal and welfare state, in decentralized anarchy or agorism—it must under all circumstances lead to the "*autonomy of the sovereign individual*" (F. Nietzsche). Not into the utopia of the few, which promises dystopia to the many. This is a categorical imperative.

Because history is written by the winners. And in times of total digitalization, the civilizational kamikaze course into the periphery of a Third World War entails unprecedented risks. After all, the Orwellian "memory hole" has long been a reality and could soon lead to future generations no longer being able to develop any awareness of what it means to lead a free and dignified life. "Big Brother" makes them gradually forget what is worth loving and suffering for. But freedom was never granted, and instead always fought for.

December 18, 2022

Life Is Beautiful!

An ode to life, love and the future.

Life is beautiful. Even if—as in the case of Roberto Benigni's tragicomedy of the same name—it has to be lived under adverse circumstances. Because our reality of life is primarily determined by ourselves. Our brain. Our individual fears. The way we perceive ourselves, society and our environment, how we reflect on this perception and which catalogue of values we use as a basis for classifying it determines whether one's own existence is perceived as a burden or a gift. Whether we go through life with our heads down and slumped shoulders or upright.

Because even in the most hostile environment, the relatively short existence of our species can be experienced as a gift, challenge and adventure. This symbolizes the role of Giosué in the multi-award-winning film mentioned at the beginning. Giosué is the young son of Guido, a Jewish Italian, embodied by Roberto Benigni. Together, the two are deported shortly before the end of the Second World War. They find themselves in the hell of a German concentration camp.

In order to protect his child's soul from the horrors of war, the camp and the genocide, Guido creates an illusory world in the concentration camp by enthusiastically telling his junior about an explosive secret, a demanding game to which the two are now exposed. The main prize: a real tank. And in order to win, Giosué

has to stick to a few rules from now on. The son is proud to have been initiated and accepts the joint challenge. In his eyes, the camp becomes a playground.

Escaping the constant threat of death becomes a tightrope act between laughing and crying. For the father, aware of the real dangers, because he is scared to death and has every effort to maintain the illusion of the game for his son in light of the omnipresent horrors. For the son, because he is confronted with a contest the tasks of which are unknown, obscure and difficult, yet whose main prize is literally the only game in town.

So the child experiences every day in true hell like an exciting trial of strength with the opposing team. The Nazis. The boy laughs, while people are spent in gas chambers in the background, does not take the gloomy everyday life seriously. He engages with his environment with daring playfulness, goes beyond himself. Sometimes he feels queasy when he gets into new situations that he doesn't understand. But he remains focused on the goal, sticks to the rules of the game and feels uplifted when Guido praises him for his commitment, courage or bravery.

When the end of the war is approaching and turmoil breaks out in the camp, Guido sets out to find his wife Dora, who is also imprisoned. He disguises himself, finds her on the other side of the huge building complex, which is sinking into chaos—and is unceremoniously shot by the Nazi henchmen. Giosué, who in the meantime makes every effort to remain undetected in a hiding place for as long as possible, is picked up shortly afterwards by invading US soldiers, who take him with them on their tank in the direction of the next town. Sitting high up on the war machine, the child spots his mother in the stream of refugees on the side of the road, who is on her way to nowhere on foot with thousands

of liberated concentration camp inmates—and excitedly tells her about his prize. He points to the tank. Giosué is surrounded by destruction, infirmity and death, but happy.

The parable of Benigni's film evokes the catastrophic status quo. Because even at the end of 2022, we are still exposed to multiple crises.

Whether military conflicts, wokeness and the Cultural Revolution, increasing poverty, hunger, explosive sick leave rates, excess mortality, environmental pollution or the extinction of species, whether deindustrialization, the supranational seizure of power by technocracy, censorship, the diminution of civil rights, the defamation of dissenters or bio-fascistic segregation—rarely has the future appeared in a paler light than now, at the beginning of the neo-feudal turning point.

In the meantime, *Homo sapiens* itself is up for grabs. The brain is regressing and has lost almost a third of its working memory since the introduction of the smartphone in 2007.

The human reproductive rate is also decreasing. The sperm count in the male seminal fluid has halved within 40 years. And the trend continues. On November 16, 2022, US Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer used this circumstance as an argument for his call to naturalize 30 million illegal immigrants in America when he said: "*We have a population that no longer reproduces itself. We only have a future if we take in refugees.*" Schumer indirectly admits what not only Elon Musk but also a large number of scientists predict: humanity will die out in the long term if we do not take countermeasures. The problem with overpopulation, a narrative disseminated by the media, does not mark the biggest stumbling block on the timeline into the future. On the contrary.

Regardless of this fact, "science" declares *Homo sapiens* to be the evolutionary defecation of the digital age. That *Homo sapiens* is not understood to include the tiny group of oligarchs and globalists who have raped, plundered, polluted the planet for generations, and driven the human family into modern slavery (indeed, it is this latter group that is funding the "science"). Who is meant, rather, is the vast majority of remaining people.

"*The useless eaters*," as Henry Kissinger called us.

In this light, even euthanasia is now back in vogue. Canada is leading the way. There, homeless people can apply for state-subsidized suicide in an uncomplicated way if they can no longer bear life on the street. Instead of helping people overcome such situations, the state encourages premature death. Even the Associated Press reported in August 2022 that "*experts are disturbed by Canada's euthanasia laws*."

Forbes Magazine even attests to the legislative monstrosities of Justin Trudeau's government "*an echo from the Nazi era*." With such breaking of taboos, it is hardly surprising that the *New York Times* began to speak out in favor of cannibalism in the summer of 2022.

These disturbing developments are flanked by a massive excess mortality of about 20 percent above the average of previous years. This shows a clear spatial and temporal correlation to the roll-out of the mRNA injections—but can hardly be associated with it according to the mainstream media. Because the vaccination is safe. As before. And as if that were not enough, the transhumanists are professing to begin putting a stop to the civilizational kamikaze course through targeted optimization of human biomass—yet it is precisely their agenda that is the final nail in the coffin for

our species. From a holistic point of view, the apocalyptic crisis cacophony of the early 2020s does not exactly elicit jumps for joy and jubilation.

Powerlessness takes hold. More and more people are confronted with problems that were previously unknown to the population in the rich industrialized nations. Energy shortages, food shortages, life at the subsistence level. Circumstances over which we do not, generally, believe to have any direct influence. Caused by transnational cartels, circles and opponents that pursue particular interests instead of the common good.

They are responsible for a faceless empire of public-private partnerships that undermines the notion of responsibility across so many levels that in the end no one takes it on.

Because of the exuberant madness, some people fall prey to the fallacy of being powerless, of being unable to do anything against the continuously more encroaching system, total digitization or an attractive cultural revolution. Even those who engage in participation, go through a real opinion-forming process and intellectually rebel against the empire usually do so passively. The crisis is "consumed." People are seemingly nourished by chaos and the onslaught of information, and then seek confirmation of their worldview, which spices up their brittle and empty lives. A behavior that hardly differs from that of the mainstream audience. And the result is also the same: lethargy.

The situation is anything but hopeless. Enlightenment, humanism and the "autonomy of the sovereign individual" (Nietzsche, 1892) are far from lost. On the contrary. If the aloof ruling caste had an easy time with its inhumane agenda and everything went smoothly, there would be no need for such a level of destruction,

propaganda and censorship. Every new divisive act testifies to the weakness of the system, conceals its Achilles' heel.

The more aggressively the oppressors act, the more violently Big Brother talks to us, manipulates and penetrates us, the more war the system instigates, the more threatened it feels and the closer its implosion. And this collapse will cause the Earth to shake much more severely than ever before in the history of civilization. For the first time, the whole of humanity has the chance to free itself from its tyrannical feudal lords and the organized crime of international financial cartels at the same time. In this scenario, it is not Rome, Athens, Moscow, Beijing or Berlin that fall—but the entire globally networked system of tumor-like corporatism.

The imposed and hastily whipped *Zeitenwende* holds a historic possibility for the sovereign to seize power peacefully. It is the first opportunity of the human family for a joint, decentralized and grassroots democratic reset. Without a president, emperor, dictator or tyrant. Without the whip of the predatory fiat financial system. The driver of this quite tough, risky and possibly lengthy course towards freedom is love, morality and courage.

You don't have to be a Che Guevara, Martin Luther King, Thomas Sankara, a genius, a hero or a martyr to make it difficult for a totalitarian system. Nor can everyone afford to openly express their oppositional stance. Nevertheless, everyone can make their daily contribution. Because the real revolution begins on a small scale, with the behavior of the individual. If you look at the resistance from the perspective of Giosué, civil disobedience, boycott and sabotage become a playful challenge in everyday life. The task is very simple: it is just a matter of throwing some sand into the gears of the technocratic-totalitarian machine. A little bit every

day. This will not stop the despotic machinery immediately, but it will slow it down noticeably. And the more people participate in this "game," the higher the chances of success.

"*Those who develop a positive attitude towards the negative, not to bless it but to protect themselves, will hold out longer*," wrote *Rubikon* editor-in-chief Roland Rottenfußer to me after reading this text, hitting the nail on the head. This is exactly why I now make a joke of doing something every day that undermines the system. And every triumph, no matter how marginal, is rewarded with a brief feeling of elation.

This starts with consistent cash payment. It is best to use a card only where there is no other way, for example when booking flights on the internet. Everything else is paid in cash, or we request that an invoice be sent to us in the mail.

No PayPal, Apple Pay, Klarna or other payment service providers. No QR codes. It is best to consistently convert account balances into physical values, even for small amounts. Only the bare essentials remain on the account. Direct debit authorizations are only granted if it is absolutely necessary. Because the central bank financial system is the bloodstream of tyranny. And with every euro that is withdrawn from it, its strength dwindles.

Personal shopping behavior can also be changed comparatively easily. Instead of buying everything in the discounter—or even worse, on Amazon—it is advisable to support the growing peer-2-peer economy and local specialist retailers. Otherwise, it will soon no longer exist, especially in small towns and villages. Food can usually be obtained directly from the producer outside the conurbations.

The drive to the farm shop in the countryside may take a little longer than going to the supermarket around the corner, but you can be sure that you will receive fresh goods and not pay unnecessary margins to middlemen who fob off their employees with minimum wages.

Alternative models such as barter, direct sales, decentralized internet, alternative means of payment, complementary currencies, agorism (a revolutionary variant of market anarchism) or anarchy are beginning to be put into practice.

And even in the digital space, a lot can be achieved with little effort. For example, obsolete applications can be found on almost every smartphone. As a rule, you only use a fraction of the installed software. Nevertheless, practically every app collects master, application and geodata in the background, which is transmitted to the manufacturer. The simple rule applies here: delete what you haven't used in the last six months. In the next step, the period may be narrowed down to three months. Until you finally only have the software on the end device that you really need.

At the least, every deletion process creates a little bit of euphoria because you have regained a bit of autonomy. The selection of digital service providers should be handled just as consistently. Anyone who believes they are in opposition to the current transformation movements towards technocracy but still has their emails managed by Google is not part of the solution and instead part of the problem. There are numerous independent providers who do not store every message and let artificial intelligence search for keywords. This applies equally to cloud providers, transfer portals, social media platforms, smartphone manufacturers and mail order companies. Those who do not boycott the supranational corporate

oligarchy should not be surprised if it spies on them, sells them, betrays them and enslaves them as part of the attention economy.

Yes, you have to leave your comfort zone every now and then, do your research, inform yourself and perhaps take one or two detours to become a grain of sand in the gears. However, if one sees this personal maturation process as a playful challenge, confronts the developments proactively and sets manageable milestones, one does not perceive the organizational reorganization of one's own life as an imposed, rushed change but as a liberating form of quiet revolution. Because the revolution doesn't just start on the street but as early at the point where you don't take the course offered by the system as the most comfortable way.

Anger, frustration and powerlessness can also be turned into positive things—if you look at the situation with a pinch of youthful recklessness and come to the defiant decision: Now more than ever!

It is crucial to act instead of just consuming the canon of crises, and to move in the right direction. Attitude counts. Not the speed.

Decentralization is the future of a civil society organized in a liberal and humanistic way. It is precisely this circumstance that makes each individual a core element, an indispensable control center, an essential piece of the puzzle of this future community of peace-loving Earthlings. And the leader of his own revolutionary movement.

No one needs a permit to be the boss of their own life. Even three and a half percent of a country's total population is enough to bring down a totalitarian system in the long term and by peaceful means, as the political scientist and author Erika Chenoweth

explains in her book *Why Civil Resistance Works* from 2011 on the basis of historical considerations. If the number of critical masses amounts to seven to ten percent, the days of the ruling system are almost certainly numbered, Chenoweth explains in lectures on the topic, referring to the numerous studies that were prepared and analyzed as part of the book project.

The political scientist confirms what is an intrinsic truth to anyone who is capable of feeling empathy—an inhumane world can only be built against the will of man. If only a small part of society has not forgotten what terms such as morality, ethics, solidarity, loyalty, freedom, peace and human dignity really stand for, a totalitarian model of rule has no chance in the long term.

So the holidays come in handy to reflect on what life is all about, to define what we stand for, in order to be able to experience yet again why humans are above all social beings. Because what screens and displays preach to us has very little to do with the reality of life. Family, friends, our beloved four-legged, furry friends, the burnt Christmas goose, grandma and her (always the same) anecdotes about the holiday, and shining children's eyes beneath the tree—that is what's life. Let's take it with humor.

If we reflect on the essentials, the challenges of our era can be met with a little defiance, recklessness and playful daring.

We have nothing to lose. But we do have something to win! Because life is beautiful.

Merry Christmas!

December 23, 2022

Excuse or Resolution

Every end has a beginning, as it were, the chance for a new start. This is also the case at the turn of the year. But all too often, resolutions quickly lead to a sobering repetition of routines of the past. Because the strongest enemy of change is and remains the excuse, or pretext. Your own inability. The time to dedicate a few unfiltered thoughts to this circumstance before midnight—in order to be able to set the stage for the best version of oneself in 2023.

New Years. Hangover mood—*Groundhog Day.* That's how the majority of the positive resolutions from the glittering New Year's Eve end. Just one morning later, the hamster wheel begins to start moving, as if there had been no motivation-drunk just the night before. Life as an endless loop.

Like in the Christmas comedy of the same name with Bill Murray, who plays a grumpy-depressive weather announcer, a bitter cynic who, due to a time loop in which he is trapped, has to relive the same daily routine until he masters the moral challenges of these fateful 24 hours and understands what really counts in life. Until he can feel love, happiness and empathy.

"In the end, the question arises: What have you done with your life? What you wish you had done, do now."
(Erasmus of Rotterdam)

The plot of the cult comedy from 1993 does not miss the reality of human existence. About 50 percent of our daily decision-making processes are based on routine. At least. They happen unconsciously. We don't actively think about it, we just do it. The relevant processes take place in brain regions that emerged early in evolutionary history. The brain works autonomously to a high degree in order to relieve itself and protect itself from overstimulation by too much input. For example, it lets us get into a car and drive to work without knowing exactly how we actually got there when we arrive. Almost as if in a trance.

Neuroscientists state that 90 to 99.9 percent of all information is processed automatically by the human brain organ. Opinions differ on the exact value—depending on how exactly "information" is to be defined. Nevertheless, even 90 percent automatism versus ten percent conscious cognitive processing of information represents, philosophically speaking, an impressive discrepancy between unconscious bobbing along and zombie-like routine on the one hand, and an expression of a supposedly free will and self-determined life on the other. Life thus seems to happen to us more than we lead it.

Moreover, the remaining ten percent of information that *Homo demens* is cerebrally capable of does not seem to make up the part of one's own thinking or personality that makes a person unique, creative, anxious or happy. This is because the brain also makes these decisions up to ten seconds earlier than the human being is even aware of the thought, decision or action in question.

The corresponding electrical impulses, the neurotransmitters, the switching of the synapses, suggest that we are doing what our operating system tells us. The subconscious. Even before you think about it, thinking about the relevant point is already done. And without us.

If a comparison with computers were to be used rhetorically at this point, one could postulate that human consciousness represents something like the graphical user interface of the computer, while in the background a deterministic automatism, a kind of program, a source code is active, which calls standardized scripts and processes—which are ultimately responsible for the maximum ten percent of conscious computing operations of daily humanoid information processing. In other words, for that part of human thinking that has so far been considered free will. The debate between neuroscientists and philosophers in this regard continues: determinism, dualism, compatibilism. The result is open. In the light of this information, one could ask oneself whether it makes sense at all to make good resolutions.

Albert Einstein is already quoted as saying:

"*"Human beings in their thinking, feeling, and acting are not free but are just as causally bound as the stars in their motions."*

And Arthur Schopenhauer was also of the opinion that "man can do what he wants, but not want what he wants." This rational-to-sobering view of man as an organism is opposed by the conviction, perceived as spirituality, that *Homo sapiens* is more than a few liters of blood and water, held together by skin and bones.

That a "*world soul*" has manifested itself, that there are other forces between heaven and earth than wind and weather, gravity, radiation or plate tectonics. That the universe is not just a hostile, cold, empty and dark unknown, but a system permeated by life. A living being in itself.

This topic could be pondered and reflected about, discussed and argued over until the wee hours of the morning. Because in the end, it's about nothing less than the meaning of life.

And although both of these views have their charm and justification, the idea of a universe filled with energy, life and mysteries, an all-encompassing world soul, is incomparably more attractive than the rationalist's serene, one-and-zero-based, reductionist worldview. At least for the last night of the year—and the expectantly sentimental gaze into a firmament lit up by stars and fireworks. December 31 calls for simple rules of thumb for a new start. For wisdom, slogans and mantras that nourish the mind and justify the supposed departure into the new. After all, it is we, ourselves, who give ourselves our motivation and meaning in life. No matter what day the calendar calls.

"*The meaning of life is to give your life meaning*"—this is the simple conclusion of a hip-hop song line that is now getting on in years. And indeed, there is more truth in this simple sentence than many a self-development book or self-management course takes a few hundred pages to explain. For "*the moment a person doubts the meaning and value of life, he is sick*," Sigmund Freud stated at the time. That can be seconded.

Reduced to the quoted phrase of a song lyric, we should view life as a challenge, as a film for which we not only wrote the script but for which we are also the director and main actor. In other words, what is important is to take life by the horns in order to work towards self-realization.

No matter what others believe, say or do. And now. Because we may only have this one chance. And the agile phase of our human existence is comparatively short, as anyone who has ever arrived in

the middle of life will notice. Only self-empowerment in all aspects of one's own being can lead us away from the powerlessness currently felt by quite a few, from shock paralysis and mental block.

At the end—and at the latest at the end of each year—we have the choice to make vague plans yet again, for an even vaguer future, and to indulge in the hope that these plans may become reality at some point; or we can accept that the only constant in life is change, to start creating it right now, and to live the life you want. Starting with January 1, 2023. Because planning security is an illusion. Moreover, the possibility of doing so depends only to a limited extent on external factors, even if these are generally considered decisive—professional disposition, education, financial resources, place of residence, et cetera.

We should be realistic—and try the impossible.

The factors which we commonly cling to in order to have an excuse not to change have long since been abandoned to decay and assimilation by postmodern times or the elite cultural revolution. In fact, there is no going back. But the horizon of the future is a broad field that needs to be cultivated. If we don't do it ourselves, others will do it for us. Just like in the past three years. Life is not something that just happens to a sovereign individual. It must be actively shaped. This sometimes begins with very small steps. Cancel your Netflix subscription and learn to play an instrument in the time that has been freed up, switch from computer games to board games, exchange 5G smart phones for 2G dumb phones, operate displays in grayscale if you aren't viewing photos on the device, and deactivate all notifications to ensure that you use new technology more consciously as a tool and to prevent *Homo sapiens* from being turned into a compliant slave of his digital helpers as well as the invasive attention economy.

Get rid of Alexa, and start shopping in local shops and from farmers in the region, not on Amazon. Pay with cash instead of PayPal, Apple Pay or credit card. Books instead of screens. Write some handwritten letters and not just emails. Remember traditions instead of following trends. Use wired headphones, and non-radiation-intensive Bluetooth. Focus on real content instead of dillydallying with an endless feed of meaningless news and clumsy propaganda. Embrace disruption as an opportunity instead of consuming it like a horror movie. We need friends, not followers. And digital detox. Travel rather than do Zoom meetings.

Eat healthy food. Engage in discussion, constructive arguing and open-ended discourse, instead of indulging in personal sensitivities, emotionalization of the debate space and dogmatic moralism. Anger, not fear. This seems to me to be the most important resolution to be made for what is to come. Because fear is the worst conceivable advisor. In all situations. Anger and rage, on the other hand, release unimagined energies and can undoubtedly be channeled productively, as some agitated lyrics, many an accusatory song or many an emotional rebuttal underline.

Conformism does not make for success stories. Discipline, perseverance, stubbornness, self-realization, clarity, conviction, courage and uncompromisingness, on the other hand, do—even if even these essentially harmless terms have come under suspicion among the cancel office owners of evoking negative associations. For they are diametrically opposed to the burgeoning, blind collectivism of the paternalistic surveillance state. Nevertheless, only such qualities have the necessary energy, the necessary momentum, to break out of echo chambers and fear bubbles. The stoically resting rock in the surf is hardly impressed by ebb and flow and storm.

Unfortunately, however, only very few have the courage to follow their moral compass regardless of the losses. Because, God forbid, that might create friction. Yet it is precisely this approach of making one's subjective catalogue of values a personal guideline for action that creates proverbial self-confidence. Those who remain true to themselves and their ethical code against all adversity constantly reassure themselves. They live congruently, so to speak, inside and outside. They bring Yin and Yang into balance.

On the other hand, those who live with a lie—those who live a lie—will neither be happy nor successful in the long run. The proverb "*Better an end with horror than a horror without end*" literally comes to mind in this context.

And the motto "*Better to die on your feet than to live on your knees*" also jumps to mind.

So, regardless of the fact that nothing would be more appropriate than to become the self-fulfilling prophecy of which one hears so much, to positively condition oneself, to personify change in order to feel on top even under adverse circumstances, many ignore and conceal the deep disgust that they must feel when they look in the mirror in the morning, knowing that they are betraying themselves. But it is hardly possible to successfully escape such deficits in the long run. You can only suppress them. This, in turn, saps the mind and body. This is probably one of the reasons why the popular drug alcohol is so often used as a medicine. So what to do? What resolution to follow? Or do you just use excuses that allow you not to have to change anything? Changes that condemn some to having to experience Groundhog Day again and again in 2023?

Maybe it doesn't have to be the big hit, the 180-degree turnaround. Maybe it's enough to actually be yourself. With all the positive

qualities, including mistakes, abysses and deficits. If you stand by them, they may turn into unknown strengths. Whatever you do, do it for yourself—not for others. Because only those who are able to have a positive relationship with themselves can establish such a relationship with other people and their environment. And a pronounced helper syndrome is not the same as honestly felt empathy.

If we succeed in anchoring a moral compass into out subconscious, in fundamentally positively conditioning ourselves, in being in harmony with ourselves in order to counter the biological automatisms of our existence described at the beginning with a spark of consciousness, a lot has already been gained.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for an exciting year, the large number of motivating letters and suggestions, the invitations, the encouragement and the criticism. I, too, will strive to be the best version of myself for the umpteenth time in 2023. That's all that's really in our power. Ideas, thoughts, words and authenticity are very powerful. So I will continue to try to put mine into texts on a regular basis. For as the past year has proven, truly moving things move *Homo sapiens* so much more than machines and the imposed collectivism of a soulless and faceless neo-capitalist empire. And often change simply begins with spending the evening hours alone with a blank sheet of paper—before surrendering to the night and giving the morning a new chance.

"I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it." (Voltaire)

December 30, 2022

About the Author

Tom-Oliver Regenauer was born in southern Germany and grew up near Baden-Baden. He has been drawn to music, art and literature from a very young age. Only a kindergartener, he was already taking an interest in songs and their lyrics, inspired by the collection of music and books surrounding him at home.

He wrote short articles and stories. At the tender age of about five, he already pursued musical ambitions and received drum lessons. Later also some violin and guitar.

Fascinated by the skateboarding wave of the 1980s and the first offshoots of globally expanding hip-hop culture spilling over into Europe, he began to get seriously involved with songwriting, DJing, graffiti, music production and urban culture in general as a teenager. He founded various bands, organized event series, concerts and parties.

At the age of eighteen, he founded a recording studio and record label with an associated event agency in his hometown. Over the past twenty years, he has produced over 1,000 recordings under various pseudonyms, for which he was responsible for songwriting as well as arrangement, mix and management.

On countless international journeys, he made a variety of contacts with musicians, authors, rappers, DJs, producers and street artists. He is considered to be well connected in the international music scene.

Tom-Oliver Regenauer has lived in Mexico City, Tel Aviv, Boston, New York, Bucharest, Lisbon, Santiago de Chile, Johannesburg, Bern, Zurich and Lugano, among others.

New music projects have recently emerged with the Wu-Tang Clan, Cee Lo Green (Goodie Mob, Gnarls Barkley), Pharrell Williams, Young Thug, Craig G (Juice Crew), Snoop Dogg and Daz Dillinger (Dogg Pound), among others. For Viva con Agua, a globally active non-profit organization, he produced the much-acclaimed campaign song #waterisahumanright at the beginning of 2020.

The renowned music magazine *laut.de* compared his sound in a portrait with that of top producers such as Pete Rock, RZA, DJ Premier, Mobb Deep or Statik Selecta (www.laut.de/dj-tom-select).

Parallel to his ventures in the fields of music, literature and art, the author worked in various industries and roles after completing his business studies. Among other things, as an operations manager, business and management consultant and as an international project manager with assignments in over twenty countries.

In 2009, he took up his main residence in Switzerland. There he founded an agency for management and communication consulting in 2015. At the beginning of 2021, Tom-Oliver Regenauer published his first book, followed by *Der Elefant im Raum* (The elephant in the room) in February 2022. He also regularly publishes texts, commentaries and essays on current topics on his homepage. (rp)

regenauer.press | sync-floyd.com | djtomselect.com |
mgmtgmbh.ch

The real revolution: doing things for their own sake.